Richard Baxters
ANSWER
TO
Dr. EDWARD STILLINGFLEET's
CHARGE of SEPARATION:

Containing,

I. Some *Queries* neceſſary for the underſtanding of his *Accuſation.*
II. A Reply to his Letter which denyeth a Solution.
III. An Anſwer to his Printed Sermon.

Humbly tendred, I. To Himſelf; II. To the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen, III. To the Readers of his Accuſation: the *Forum* where we are Accuſed.

Acts 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than theſe neceſſary things.* Rom. 14. 1, 17, 18. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive, but not to doubtful Diſputations. For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteouſneſs and peace and joy in the Holy Ghoſt. For he that in theſe things ſerveth Chriſt, is acceptable to God, and approved of men.*
Phil. 3. 16. *Neverthleſs, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the ſame Rule, let us mind the ſame things.*—15 *If in any thing ye be otherwiſe minded, God ſhall reveal even this unto you.*

LONDON, Printed for *Nevil Simmons*, at the Three Cocks at the *Weſt-end* of St. *Paul's*, and *Thomas Simmons* at the Princes Arms in *Ludgate-ſtreet*, MDC LXXX.

THE PREFACE.

Readers,

I. IF you would be truly informed of the Case of the Nonconformists, and the meaning of this Defence, you must know 1. That the meer Nonconformists of this age take not up their Judgment in trust from any party of men, and therefore take not themselves obliged to be for or against any thing, because men were so that were called Nonconformists heretofore: As the Scripture is their Rule and objective Religion, so they reverence the judgment of the Primitive Church above the judgment of any party; And indeed are so far against Sects and Parties as such, as that their judgment is that the Church will never be well restored to desireable Concord, till our Union be Catholick, upon the terms that Christ appointed and which all good Christians have agreed in, and may agree in.

2. That what the meer Nonconformists of this age desired for Concord and Reformation, as to the old Liturgy and Conformity, is best known by their common Proposals 1660, all the Ministers of London being by Mr. Calamy, Mr. Ash and Dr. Reynolds, invited to Sion-Colledg freely to give their judgments: who offered nothing for Church-Government but Bishop Usher's Primitive form, and nothing for Worship but the Reforming of the Liturgy, and the free use of additional formes: Their exceptions against passages in the Liturgy being not thought absolutely necessary to Communion. And it must be remembred that they offered then, 1. A Defence of those Exceptions, 2. A Reformed Liturgy or Additions, 3. A Petition for Peace and preventing Schism, to the Bishops, which they never answered to this day, that we know of.

3. You must know that the Change of the Liturgy on pretense

of easing us, and the Act of Uniformity, have made Conformity now quite another thing than it was before, and to us far more intollerable; I am past doubt that Ri. Hooker, *Bishop* Bilson, *Bi-* Usher *and such others were they now alive would be Nonconformists; yea, I can prove it, as well as I can prove that they were honest men, and would hold to what they wrote.*

4. *You must know that we had never leave to give our Reasons against the New Conformity; nor allowed to be once heard speak for our selves, before about two thousand Ministers were silenced; when our Judicatures will hear a single Malefactor. We have been silent about eighteen years, while men have call'd to us* [What is it that you would have?] *while they would not give us leave to tell them.*

5. *And when the Press was somewhat open, they spread it abroad that* [our silence now plainly shewed that we had nothing to say, but kept up a Schism against our own Consciences.]

6. *At last, though my Friends had long told me that our* Lives *must be our best* Defence, *and that our* Accusers *would but be inflamed by an Apology, and could not endure to hear our Reasons, I durst forbear no longer, but yet ventured no farther than to write a bare Narrative of the* Matter of our Nonconformity, *lest arguing should exasperate: But that very naming of the things which we deny, hath much displeased them that differ from us, supposing that it implyeth an accusation of them, which I renounced.*

7. *The Reader then that will understand our Case, must not look to find it here, but be at the labour to read what is already written of it, which we must not repeat as oft as any will write against us; that is,* 1. *In the said unanswered writings of* 1661. 2. *In the Kings Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, for which the* London *Ministers subscribed and printed a Thanksgiving.* 3. *In my first Plea for Peace, describing our Nonconformity.* 4. *In the Defence of it against Mr.* Cheyny's *Answer.* 5. *In my second Plea for Peace, describing our Judgment of Government and obedience, and what our Nonconformity is not, and divers other points.* 6. *In my* True and only way of Universal Concord,

cord, *on which the Churches must agree, if ever.* 7. *In my* Moral Prognostication. 8. *In my Abridgment of Church-History of Bishops and Councils, shewing what hath divided the Churches heretofore.*

8. *You must know that I write not to justifie every man that is called a Nonconformist, but to give an Answer to the publick Accusation of my self, and a Reason of the Preaching of the meer Nonconformists.*

9. *But that the fuller Justification of our Preaching is intended in another Treatise, called* Their Apology, or Third Plea for Peace.

II. *And as to the prosecution of the debate with this Reverend Doctor, it is not likely that I shall trouble him with any Rejoinder if he Reply, unless he will take another course, and first explain our terms, and state the question to be disputed. Much less shall I contend with any substitute who shall avoid the way of Love and Reason, which from the Doctor I may expect.*

There is one sort of Disputants that are too strong *for me,* Those that have a better Cause; *Truth will overcome: Light will appear through narrow cranies. Of these I shall be glad to be overcome: I protest, that to my knowledg, I never managed a Dispute, in which I trusted not to the Goodness of my Cause, more than to wit or words or humane advantage.*

But there are above twenty sorts of other Disputants, too hard for me to overcome.

1. *Those that will Dispute before they agree of the sense of their terms or state the question, and then quarrel for not being understood.*

2. *Those that will not read or answer our fullest Defence already written, but look I should still begin anew.*

3. *Universallists, that can prove me to be an Ass, because I am an Animal.*

4. *Equivocaters, that can prove me a* Separatist *because I sit not at their feet, or read not in their Book or with their Spectacles.*

5. *A Pope that taketh it for a Heresie or Crime to question his word, or suppose him fallible.*

6. *A*

6. *A proud meer Grammarian, who can confute* Ariſtotle *and the School-men with a ſcorn, and taketh it for a diſgrace to have any more Logick than ſimple terms; or taketh Rhetorick for the pureſt fruit of Reaſon.*

7. *A Nominal, who contracteth all his Syllogiſms into ſimple terms of art, and can confute any Adverſary, by calling him a Fool, or a Rogue, or a Heretick, or a Schiſmatick.*

8. *One that ſtandeth ſo high that he thinks men below him to be little things like walking Crows.*

9. *A one-eyed man that can ſee nothing but on his own ſide.*

10. *A galled perſon that ſmarteth if the wind blow on him: And a melancholly man that thinketh that all that you think and ſay is againſt him, and would kill him.*

11. *I cannot diſpute againſt Canons and Organs, that ſpeak ſo loud that none can be heard but themſelves. Nor againſt ringing Bells, that have loud tongues and no ears: and go on, on, on, and take no heed to what is anſwered.*

12. *Nor againſt ſuch as* Iſa. 48.4. *Iron is too ſtiff for me to bow, and I can make no impreſſion upon braſs.*

13. *Nor can I deal with ſuch as are deſcribed,* Hoſ. 7. 4, 6, 7. *Such an Oven hath too wide a mouth and too hot a breath for me to contend with.*

14. *Nor ſuch as* Pſal. 59. 7. *and* 55. 21. *that ſpeak* ſwords, *or diſpute with hands and not with tongues: and fetch their arguments from the Priſon, or the Lyons, and ſpeak not to the ear, but to the fleſh and bones. Nor ſuch as* 2 Sam. 23. 6. Iſa. 27.4. Mic. 7. 4. *Thorns and Bryers ſpeak too feelingly. If I muſt diſpute with ſtings, I had rather it were with Bees that will recompence me, than with Waſps or Hornets.*

15. *I am too weak for men over valiant, that can venture upon any thing, and eaſily prove that the Snow is black.*

16. *And my voice is too low for the dead and deaf and ſleepy and drunken, that when I have ſpoken know not what I ſaid.*

17. *I am loath to enter the Liſts with thoſe women that never want time, or heat, or words, and ſeldom foul ones,* [Nam ſi cum ſtercore certo, vinco ſeu vincor, ſemper ego maculor.]

18. *Nor*

18. *Nor am I able to deal with a Crowd or Multitude, where they follow the Leader, and cry,* Away with him, *when few know whom or what they are against.*

19. *Nor yet with Lads that are too quick for me, and value* Mercury *above Gold, that have quick Trade but little stock, and think age and experience to be the Characters of dull declining Wits.*

20. *And I am too weak to dispute a man out of Love with his Life, or his Pleasure, Wealth or Honour. All Church-History tells me how rarely any ever scrupled the Lawfulness of being made Pope or Patriarch, or hath been argued out of a Bishoprick or Dominion. I am not strong enough to answer an hundred pound a year, much less a thousand (though Grace and Conscience is.)*

21. *But though all this be not the Case of the Reverend Doctor, yet one advantage (though uncertain) he hath: He is like to* over-live me, *and so may have the* last word; *And that is a certain Victory with the sequacious multitude. But yet Truth will triumph, and fraud will vanish, and secret things shall be brought to light, and that which is crookned by the Judgment of men shall be set strait by the infallible final judgment.*

For

For the Reverend Doctor Stillingfleet, *Dean of St.* Pauls

Reverend Sir,

AS you have told the Magistrates and the World what you think of *me* as guilty of sinful separation, I have reason to hope that you will not deny me your help for my own conviction: For it concerneth no man so nearly to know my sin as my self: and being so near my day of Judgment, I were a most inexcusable wretch if I were unwilling to know it. You knew their capacity it's like, for whom you preacht and wrote; but I, that best know my own, finding it impossible to understand you and your accusation without further help, presume to intreat your speedy Answer to these Questions which are the stop of my Conviction.

I. *Q.* I entreat you to tell me more plainly, *which is the constitutive Regent part of a National Church?* Whether the King, or a Sacerdotal Head? For that you know, that a Church as well as a Kingdom, is essentiated by a *pars regens*, and *pars subdita*, I long ago found in your *Irenicon*. I have opened the state of the Question in my first *Plea, page* 251, 252, &c. Of which I crave your Solution: For to hear of [*One Head,*] and not know who it is, is no satisfaction to me.

II. *Q.* I intreat you to tell me more plainly what the [*One Rule*] meant in your Text was, which was then extant, and all that had attained to be true Christians were then and are now to agree in and walk by. For I perceive you truly judge that it was somewhat then known to them; and yet in your application one would think you meant some late humane Laws.

Was it a Divine Rule or a Humane? If Humane, how to know it.

III. *Q.* I beseech you tell me plainly, what is the *definition* or *formal reason* of that sinful *separation* which you mention as mine. For I cannot perceive it by your Book: unless you take *Preaching without the Magistrates Leave*, and Worshiping in a manner different from that appointed by Law, and forbidden, to be it. But I suppose you take not all Disobedience to be Separation, nor all different Modes of Worship. I would fain know what you mean.

IV. *Q.* I intreat you tell me plainly, what you would have the many score thousands do on the Lords days, who cannot hear in the Parish Churches? For the matter of fact is past dispute, that in your Parish of St. *Andrews, Sepulchres, Giles Cripplegate, Giles in the Fields, Martins,*

tins, Clements, and many others, there are in some 10000, in some 20000, in some 30000, in some the Parishioners say, 60000 Inhabitants more than can come into the Church and hear the Ministers voice; which seldom can be heard by more than 3000 or 4000. How would you have all these score thousands spend the Lords day?

V. *Q.* Are you not conscious that the true Pastoral Office is not performed in your own Parish to the third part of the people according to their need, and *Pauls* example *Act.* 20. by reason of the number of them? Prudent peaceable men of your Parish tell me, that not one of five of their neighbours ever use to go to any Church: And out of the Church never hear a word from the Pastor, unless at the Baptizing of a Child; but live like Heathens without any publick Worship of God: And the worst men that most need help least desire it, and therefore easiliest take the excuse that at the Parish Church there is no room, and if they go to others they are called Separatists; but not if they play, work or drink at home.

VI. *Q.* I am confident you know the need of many Curates in your own Parish; (for my part, I profess, I am so far from thinking my self capable of a Bishops work, that I would not take many 1000 *l.* a Year to take the Pastoral Charge of your Parish without many assistants) seeing then you and I (as I see by your Treat. of Satisfaction and other Doctrinal Books) do Preach the same Doctrine, and I perform but the part of a Curate or Assistant to you for nothing, Why think you that it is worse than that so many be untaught?

VII. *Q.* Do you not think that culpably to alienate an Ordained Minister, Vowed to the Sacred Office, is far worse sacriledge than to steal Church-plate or Moneys? And that it must needs be so culpable, either in our selves for not Conforming, or for ceasing our works, or else in those that hinder us.

VIII. *Q.* What then is it that you would have us do, when after our best endeavours we are no more able to see the Lawfulness of Conforming or forsaking our Calling, than of many great notorious sins?

IX. *Q.* Do you think that for qualification and number there are so many better than the silenced Ministers in the Land, as may so far supply the Peoples wants, as that 2000 such as we may better be spared, than employed, unless we can Conform?

X. *Q.* Are none of our Hearers more competent Judges than their Accusers, what profiteth their own Souls? And if they are, what is the great harm that such as I do, that weighs down the Peoples profit; while all your power is for edification, and all your Churches that I come in are full?

XI. *Q.* What is it in us that warranteth a humble Conformist to

think, that his Miniſterial duty is ſo much better than ours, that in compariſon of his Miniſtry, ours is unneceſſary and we unſufferable in the Land: Is it our *ignorance* or our *wickedneſs* that makes the difference ſo great? I have ſtudied many years longer than you, though perhaps with leſs advantage: We know nothing in the world that we prefer before the pleaſing of God, and edifying his Church? Though you excel us, do all others ſo? My meaning is, would you have none tolerated in *England* that are as *ignorant* and as *bad as I, Conſideratis conſiderandis*. Doth bare Conforming make all this difference?

XII. *Q.* And as I ask all theſe Queſtions for my ſelf (and earneſtly intreat your Anſwer) pardon me while in true love to you, I put this Queſtion to you for your ſelf; Whether do you think, if you lived in the pain, and as near the Grave as I do, and by the ſentence of death had the lively apprehenſions of your account, ſhould you not tremble to think of becoming a Preacher againſt our Preaching, and juſtifying or owning the ſilencing and ruining of ſo many hundred devoted Miniſters of Chriſt, who are no worſe, and for no worſe Cauſe? Such as truly deſire to ſerve God as faithfully and diligently as your ſelf, and with as little reſpect to preferment, riches, applauſe, or any worldly end? And whether you will never wiſh that you had never put your hand to ſuch a work, as to argue with the Magiſtrate and harden others, againſt the enduring of ſuch mens labours, even on the hard terms that we willingly perform them.

Sir, Many importune me to publiſh an Anſwer to your Sermon: 1. As to my ſelf, I am more concerned to crave your help for my conviction, if I live in ſin at ſo dear a rate, even to my fleſh: 2. And as to you, you have deſerved ſo well of this Land, eſpecially for ſo ſtoutly oppoſing Popery at ſuch a time, and are ſo much loved and valued by us all, that I would take the leaſt provoking way; as knowing what contention and exaſperation tendeth to, and how glad the Papiſts will be to turn your Pen from themſelves, and leave you and ſuch as I, together in a fruitleſs conflict: waiting your Anſwer, I reſt

Your unworthy fellow-ſervant,

May 29. 1680. Ri. Baxter.

Dr.

Dr. Stillingfleet's *Answer to Mr.* Baxter's *Letter.*

SIR,

I *Lately received a Letter from you, wherein you complain of my exposing you to the Magistrates and the World, as one guilty of sinful Separation; whereas I never mentioned your name, when I Preached, and when I Printed the Sermon, I have quoted it several times against Separation. But if your meaning be, that you think your self concerned in those practises which I charge with that guilt, I should have been very glad to have found in your Letter an Answer to those Reasons in my Sermon which moved me to judg as I then did, and still do concerning them, Which in my opinion had been a far more likely way for your Conviction, which you seem to desire in your Letter, than my Answering those Queries you propose; many of which do very little relate to the matter in debate between us. What you mean by my knowing their capacity for whom I preached and wrote, I am not willing to understand; but if I have any, the single Question between you and me, as to this matter, is, Whether the upholding Separate Meetings for Divine Worship, where the Doctrine established, and the substantial parts of Worship are acknowledged to be agreable to the Word of God, be a sinful separation, or not?* §. 1. §. 2. §. 3. §. 4. §. 6.

By Separate Meetings, I mean such as pretend to a purer way of Worship, and are kept up in opposition to the legal establishment of Religion among us. And now Sir, I pray consider,

First, To what purpose I should resolve the Queries you make concerning our great Parishes, since, §. 7.

1. *The Separate Meetings are kept up in the City, and adjoyning places, as* Hackney, Newington, *&c. without any regard to the greatness of Parishes or capacity of Churches.* §. 8.

2. *You cannot but know, that the People do not go to them, because they cannot find room in Churches, but because they look upon the Worship of God, as purer there, than in our Parochial Churches; and most of those who frequent them, would not come to the publick Worship, were our Churches never so great, or our Parishes never so small.* §. 9.

3. *The preaching in them is forbidden by Law, which the greatness or smallness of our Parishes doth not make more or less lawful to be done; unless those who preach in them do Conform to the Laws established; and so I grant you, the Tabernacle in St.* Martin's *Parish, is now a help to the* §. 10.

§. 11. Parish Church, which before was a separate Meeting. And I wonder a Person of your Sagacity should think to satisfie your self, or others, by such slight evasions as these, which scarce any of my Auditors or Readers, how mean soever their capacities were, but could discern the weakness of them.

§. 12. Secondly, Others of your Queries relate to the Qualifications and number of the ejected Ministers, and comparing their Gifts with Ours.

But what is all this to the business of Separation? unless you suppose that the Gospel is not preached by Us; or whether it be or not, that you are bound to preach it still, and so much seems to be implied in your 7th Question, viz. That it is a Sacriledge culpably to alienate an Ordained Minister vowed to the Sacred Office. And because this comes nearest to the matter in hand, and seems very much to stick with you, I shall desire you to resolve these Queries.

1. Whether it be not in the power of those who give Orders in a Christian Church to limit and suspend the Exercise of the Ministerial Function without Sacriledge? If not, how could the Christian Church in its best and purest times, pretend to reduce Bishops and Presbyters to a Lay-Communion? of which you may read so often in St. Cyprian's Epistles. Nay what Church is there to be named, that doth not assume this power to it self, without the least suspition of Sacriledge? And it would be very strange, that this Notion of Sacriledge should never be understood before.

§. 13. 2. Whether Christian Magistrates may not justly restrain those Ministers from Preaching, who, after the experience of former Troubles, do refuse to renounce those Principles which they judge do naturally tend to involve us again in the like Troubles?.

3. To what purpose any such Authority is either in Church or State, if those who are legally silenced may go on to preach publickly in opposition to

§. 14. the established Laws; only on supposition that they were wrongfully ejected? This I am certain is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Non-conformists of former times, as you may see in the Book published in their name by Mr. Rathband, A. D. 1644. p. 41. (besides what you may find in my Sermon, p. 51. only the Testimony of Dr. Gouge ought to be corrected thus, p. 513, 514.) Their words are, If a guiltless Person put out of his charge by the Churches Authority, may yet continue in it, what proceedings can there be against guilty Persons. who in their own conceit are always guiltless, or will at least pretend so to be; seeing they also will be always ready to object against the Churches judgment, that they are called of God; and may not therefore give over the execution of their Ministry at the will of Man.

§. 15. 4. Whether there be the same obligation now lying upon Ministers to preach the Gospel, in a Nation where the Gospel is confessed to be truly preached, when they are forbidden to do it by the Laws of the Land; as there was upon the Apostles to preach it first to the World, notwithstanding the prohibitions of men?

The

The disparity seems so obvious to me, that I could hardly believe men of understanding would alledge the Apostles words to justifie their present practises, had I not so often seen it done. But that the old Non-conformists did truly understand the disparity of the case, you may see it in 3 instances in the former Book, which I shall refer you to.

But you ask one material Question in behalf of the People, viz. *Are none* §. 16. *of our hearers more competent judges than their Accusers what profiteth their own souls? And is this in your judgment, a tolerable Plea for Separation? then there can be no such thing as an unjustifiable or sinful separation; since the People are left to be their own judges. For where was any separation made but upon such a pretence? And upon this ground the people may leave you to morrow, and go to Doctor* O. *and leave him next week and go to the* Anabaptists, *and from them to the* Quakers; *and still plead that they are more competent judges than their Accusers, what profiteth their own souls. No one would think by such Questions as these, that ever you had written so much against Separation, and spoken so freely of the mischief of it. Thus* §. 17. *I have pickt out those Queries, which come nearest to the matter of Separation, and given a sufficient Answer to them. But as to the other remaining, concerning the constituent regent part of a National Church; the One Rule mentioned by the Apostle; and whether you or I have studied longer or to better purpose, I have in civility passed them over, as no more relating to our business, than determining the Principle of Individuation, is, to the keeping of the sixth Commandment. And I am resolved in debates of this nature* §. 18. *not to be drawn off by any by-Queries from the main thing in Controversie. I do not press you to any speedy Answer, but I desire you rather to weigh and consider things impartially, than to give too hasty a Reply. I am neither fond of Controversie, nor can I desert so just and clear a Cause as I take this against Separation to be; from which I shall not be moved by the noise and censures of weak and injudicious people, who I find (as you formerly observed) can least endure to be touched in this matter. If you please at your leisure to to return an answer to this paper, it shall be thankfully received by*

SIR,

Your faithful Friend
and Servant,
EDWARD STILLINGFLEET.

My sudden removal into the Country upon the receipt of yours, must excuse my sending this no sooner.

A Reply to Dr. Stillingfleet's *Letter; being the ſum of our Controverſie.*

§. 1. I Confeſs I was ſo well aſſured of the Divine obligations which lay on me, to do theſe things which you judge my ſin, that my expectations from your return were very low: But yet I thought it my duty to try whether you had more than I knew of to ſay for my Conviction, before I ventured on a Defence: But your refuſal to convince and ſatisfie me, increaſeth my confidence, that it is my great duty which you account my ſin.

§. 2. Did you not write to be underſtood? Or muſt *I only* not underſtand you? muſt I trouble the Reader by gathering all the paſſages, where you expreſly ſpeak to me, *viz.* As *One of them*; and as going *beyond the Independants*, and preaching *unlawfully* to them that *unlawfully* hear, and as dealing *more diſingeniouſly* and *leſs fairly* than the old Separatiſts, and ſo almoſt from end to end.

§. 3. Seeing you *ſhould have been very glad to have found an anſwer to your Sermon*, an Anſwer you ſhall have.

§. 4. Seeing you will no further explain your great word [*ſeparation*,] I will anſwer it where I find it in your Sermon: And if the Caſe muſt be no more intelligibly ſtated, I muſt take it as you will do it.

§. 5. To ſum up all, as far as I am able to underſtand you, your Sermon containeth, 1. The grounds ſuppoſed on which you build. 2. Your Accuſation of us on thoſe grounds: 3. The *penalties* which you juſtifie, 4. And the cure which you deſire.

I. As far as you are intelligible to me, your ſuppoſed grounds are, that [*God hath authorized the Magiſtrate*, 1. *To chooſe what perſons every man in his dominions ſhall entruſt his ſoul to, as the Paſtor, whoſe Conduct he is bound in Conſcience to obey*: 2. And alſo to *chooſe and command, in what words only every Paſtor ſhall publickly pray to God*; and what *Books and words of men he ſhall profeſs aſſent and conſent to*; and what *dedicating ſymbols of Chriſtianity he ſhall uſe as engaging in the Chriſtian Covenant*, and to *command Ceremonies and Modes, for diſſent wherein he ſhall deny Baptiſm, and Church-Communion to all diſſenters, though the things be taken to be indifferent by the Magiſtrate, and great ſins by the diſſenters.* 3. And that all that obey not in all theſe, but preach when forbidden, or uſe other accidents or modes, and chooſe other Paſtors to be their Guides, are Separatiſts and ſin againſt God.

II. On

II. On theſe grounds you judg me and ſuch others ſinful Separatiſts.

III. You juſtifie the executing of the Laws upon us, and would have us ſilenced, and ſuch diſſenters not endured.

It is our (Conformity, or our) ceaſing to Preach which you plead for as the Cure.

§. 6. I. As to your ſuppoſed ground, 1. You know, it's like, that in my firſt *Plea for Peace*, I largely confuted it: And could you think that without any reply your bare ſaying over the thing confuted, could be any ſatisfaction, to one of any ſenſe or conſcience.

2. You cannot but know that the judgment and practice of the Univerſal Church in *Eaſt* and *Weſt* hath been againſt you, not only for the firſt 300 years, but for many hundred after. Father *Paul Sarpi* after cited, in his Hiſtory of Church Revenues truly teſtifieth it: I have proved it by many Canons and Hiſtories in my Church Hiſtory; that he was to be taken as no Biſhop that was choſen by Magiſtrates, Prelates or any, without the *Clergies election*, and the *Peoples election* or *conſent*: Chriſtians then took not this to be any part of the Princes truſt: but only to countenance the things that furthered Learning and Godlineſs, and encourage the Clergy and People to chooſe the beſt, and to protect and encourage and govern them by the ſword when they were choſen. This being paſt doubt, were the Univerſal Church Separatiſts? Is *our Concent* with the Univerſal Church, or *your ſingularity* from it, liker to Schiſm or Separation?

3. I know that there are inconveniences in the peoples conſenting power, and ſo there are in all humane affairs; but not to be cured by pernicious miſchiefs. You will not tell me, becauſe you cannot tell me, how we ſhall know what Magiſtrates they be that have this truſt? Whether Heathens, Infidels, Mahometans, Socinians, Arians, Macedonians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Image-worſhipers, Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, or who? and who muſt judge of their qualifications? Yea, were we ſure that the Prince were Orthodox, if he were but wicked, debauched, an enemy to ſerious practical piety, as all wicked men naturally are inclined to be, will not all ſuch chooſe Biſhops and Paſtors like themſelves? what more natural than to propogate our like?; And will not wicked Biſhops make wicked Prieſts? And you know the Patron hath the choice with us, and it's a ſlender qualification which the Biſhop hath power to require, without a *quare impedit*: An Atheiſt, a Fornicator, a *drunkard*, a *hater* of *holineſs*, *hath nevertheleſs* the choice of a Prieſt for the Pariſh, to whom all the People muſt entruſt their Souls. What a ſad Caſe were the Chriſtian World in, if we may lawfully have no other Paſtors than Gentlemen and Princes chooſe for us? When Chriſt tells us, how hard it is for the Rich to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven?

and

and how few of the Noble are called, and [*in uno annulo*, &c.] is become a Proverb. What a Case were *Hungary*, *Poland*, *France*, *Germany*, and the *Greek* Churches in, if this were true?

4. *Personal power* in man is the first: *Family power is the next*: City and Kingdom *power* supposeth these and cannot destroy them: Hence subjects that are not meer slaves, stand up to plead for their *Personal* and *Domestick property*, *liberty* and *power*. If my Money, and Limbs and Life be not at the Patrons or the Princes will, much less my Soul. He is trusted with my Estate and Life; but I am first and more trusted with them. He may keep out ill Physitians from the Land, and encourage the good; but he hath no power to tie me to an ill Physitian, nor to an ill Diet, nor to ill Servants, &c. The choice of these belongeth to my self. Much less can he on pretence of Parish-order tie me to an ignorant, drunken, Malignant, or an unexperienced sapless Teacher, that is to my Soul as a silly Emperick to my health. Scripture and the Worlds experience tell how much God morally giveth his light and grace, according to the aptitude of means: *Habitus infusi se habent ad modum acquisitorum*, is common in the *Schools*. Twenty sinners are usually sooner brought to repentance under skilful fit Teachers, than under one unskilful or ungodly men. And no man hath power from God, to damn my Soul; or forbid me the needful means of my salvation. No man is so much concerned as my self what becometh of me for ever: and I will not believe that the Patron loveth me and all the Parish better than we love our selves.

England hath been blest with better Rulers than other Lands: But one Rule must in this be held to by all the Churches. And if you would even here appeal to experience, I will not here stay to tell you the names of 8 or 9 or 10 ignorant Readers, most Drunkards, some rarely, half never preaching, that I was bred under, nor what a stock of such our Country had, and how very thin pious tolerable preachers were: nor what worthy men *Aldermanbury*, *Black-Fryers*, the *Inns-of-Courts*, and most places have had where the people chose.

But Reason signifieth little with most, who are on his side that talketh to them with the best advantage: I insist on this, You go against all the ancient Fathers and Churches for many hundred Years, and are so far a Separatist from more than one Parish-Priest.

II. And therefore your Accusation of us thus grounded is Schismatical and unjust, and recoileth on your self, who instead of *Gods Rule* that *all should walk by*, accuse them that walk not by your novel crooked Rules, which may make as many modish Religions as there are Princes.

III. And your desire of our *silencing* and not being *tolerated*, I will only here lament, and after speak to.

IV. And.

IV. And as your Cure by our *Conformity* is impoſſible; ſo that by *ſilencing* will be none, but increaſe the diſeaſe.

§. 7. Is it not a very uncharitable thing of you, that when it's I whom you have called to account, you flatly deny or ſhun to give me an Anſwer to my Caſe, and to the Caſe of all others that preach only in Pariſhes, where few of the people can hear in the Church. Why ask you [*To what purpoſe ſhould you reſolve thoſe Queries?*] I Anſwer to ſhew me whether my preaching be my Sin, or Duty: And whether you juſtly or unjuſtly accuſed me, and all ſuch others; was it not to this purpoſe that I craved your Anſwer?

2. And do you not know, that in the Bills of Mortality it appeareth that the Pariſhes within the Walls are but about the ſeventh part of the whole; and the outer Pariſhes, which are thus great, are about ſix parts: And in theſe Pariſhes it is not the tenth part in ſome and the ſixth in moſt that can come within the Church to hear. And it's pity that one half, or two or three parts of ſuch a City as *London* ſhould be left like the *Indians* without any publick Teaching and Worſhip, and ſuch as you ſay ſo much for it.

§. 8. You ſay, *The Separate Meetings are kept in the City*, Hackney, Newington, *&c.*

Anſ. 1. What's that to me, and all ſuch other. 2. I can tell that ſome City Churches are yet unbuilt, and the Tabernacles will not hold the people (as Chriſt-Church, and others.) 3. And divers keep Meetings *within the Walls*, where they found moſt peace, for the *reception of thoſe without the Walls*, that cannot come into their own Churches. 4. What's done at *Newington* I know not; But at *Hackney* I know of two Meetings, where the Miniſters ſo preach out of the time of Publick worſhip, that none may be hindred from going to it, and deny not Communion with the Pariſh-Churches: And they tell me, that as the Incumbent Officiateth by another, ſo the Pariſh is ſo great, and the Preachers Voice ſo low, that a great part cannot hear him.

5. Why do you ſay *they are ſeparate Meetings*, when you know that you have caſt them out: The Preachers had rather preach in your Temples, and they cannot be ſuffered: Preachers and *People* that are profeſſed Nonconformiſts but in opinion are by the Canon *ipſo facto Excommunicate*.

§. 9. As to what you ſay of the Reaſon of their Meetings; I Anſwer, 1. I think (as far as I can judge) the moſt of my Hearers, (I think ten or twenty to one) do alſo hear in the Pariſh Churches: So that your Charge of Separation againſt them is but for *hearing both*: And I believe it is ſo with many others. 2. Every one that preferreth better, doth not ſeparate from all the reſt: Your Church alloweth any free Man to forſake and change his Biſhop and Pariſh Prieſt as oft as he will; ſo he will but

change his dwelling: And in *London*, Lodgers may change frequently. If I know those called Puritans better than you, I must profess that I believe of the two it is more the *Preacher* and his *Preaching* which maketh the difference with them than the *Liturgie*. For my part I seldom hear any but very good well studied Sermons in the Parish Churches in *London* where I have been: But most of them are more fitted to well bred Schollars, or judicious hearers, than to such as need more practical Subjects, and a more plain familiar easie mode: And it is not your Reasoning that will bring all Appetites to the same Food; nor make the same Books serve every Form. I have always found that such conformable Preachers, as were Mr. *Bolton*, Mr. *Fenner*, Mr. *Whately*, Bishop Usher, &c. Were flockt after by those called *Puritans*, as much as the Non-conformists. But when they find all together, 1. That the worship and the preaching is more suitable to their good, 2. And that their Souls have need of much other Parochial help than publick. 3. And doubt of the calling of obtruded men, no wonder if they prefer the other.

§. 10. But you lay the stress on the *Prohibition of the Law, which the greatness or smallness of the Parish doth not make more or less Lawful.*

Ans. God hath commanded all Christians ordinarily to Learn and Worship him under the Conduct of his Institution; all Christians grant this. No man hath power to forbid this: All Law that forbiddeth it is of no Obligation. In a Parish where 10000, 20000, 40000, cannot come within the Church to hear; if they have no other place to go to, they must forbear all publick Learning and Worship: So that the *English* of your Words is, that if the Law forbid the most of the People all Publick Learning and worship of God, it is there as unlawful for any to Congregate against that Law as where there is no such need. But 1. I again tell you, Councils, Doctors and the Universal Church thought otherwise, and abhor'd this Doctrine. 2. Why will you not give us one word of proof but your naked Authority to prove such Authority in the Magistrate and to satisfie us what Rulers have it, and how far it reacheth: Hath the King enabled Justices to depose him, or cast down his Honour or Prerogative? Hath God given Magistrates Authority to damn as many Souls as they will; by keeping them from the means of knowledge, Faith and Holiness; and to forbid his Subjects to Worship God? Did *Robert Grosthead* of *Lincoln* take this to be the greatest Sin save Antichrists, and do you take it for an Act Authoriz'd? Is it unlawful to preach when forbidden, or worship God when forbidden, at *Japon*, *Indostan*, *China*, *Turkie*, *France*, &c. or only in *England*? and where?

§. 11. Yet do you conclude [" I wonder a Person of your sagacity " should think to satisfie your self or others, by such slight evasions as these, " which scarce any of my Auditors, or Readers how mean so ever their " Capacities were, but could discern the weakness of them.

Answ.

Answ. 1. O pity then the frailty of humane understanding! I get nothing by it if I err, but my great labour and the hazard of my Salvation by Sin! It must needs be then against my will; and is none of my size to be endured? How few Congregations are so happy as yours, if all your Auditors are so much wiser? But, 1. Be the thousands of your Parish as wise that *hear you not*? 2. How come some that I thought the wisest that I know of your Auditors, to say as I say, and lament your Case?

Reader, you see here that it must be somewhat better than the confidence of Teachers, that must guide and secure the peoples Faith. This Reverend Man you see is most confident of the strength of his Reasons and the slightness of mine: And I am so far past doubt on the other side, as that I think he overthroweth all Religion, and seteth up Man in open Rebellion against God: He may as well wonder that I take any thing to be of Divine command: If all Publick Worship is sinful, when forbidden, all Private may be so too. *Daniel* may go to the Lyons: The Martyrs, Fathers, Councels, the Universal Church are all foolisher than the meanest of his Auditors. It's strange that he can be sure Gods Word is true; and yet be so sure that Mens Laws are above it, and may suspend it; when yet Men's Laws have no more strength than Gods Laws give them.

1. I believe that the Spirit of God hath said, *Forsake not the assembling of your* selves together; know them that labour *among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and esteem them very highly in Love for their work sake*, 1 Thess. 5. 12, 13. That *have spoken to you the word of God, that watch for your Souls*, Heb. 13. 17, 24. How shall they hear without a preacher, *&c. Rom.* 10.

2. I believe that where the Gospel is hid, it is hid to them that are lost: And without knowledge the Heart is not good, and without Faith there is no Salvation; and that it is Life Eternal to know God in Christ.

3. Therefore they that forbid Men to hear and worship God Publickly, forbid what God commandeth; and what is ordinarily needful to Salvation.

4. I believe that God is Almighty, the highest Universal King, and we are all his Subjects; and the Scripture is his Law.

5. I believe that there is no Power but from him, and that he hath given none against him, or his Laws, nor above him; and that man is not God; and that we must obey God rather than Man, when they Contradict.

6. I believe that we must Love, Fear, and Serve God above all, and Worship him according to his word, and Honour his Name, and keep holy his day, whoever forbid it: And that we must Love our Neighbour as our selves, and help to save him as we may.

7. I believe that I must love my self, and seek the saving of my Soul though the Law forbad me.

8. I believe, that a Father must be honoured, and having care of his Childrens Life and Soul, he must command them necessary Food and Means for Body and Soul, and they must obey him, if the Law forbad it.

9. I believe that murdering Souls privatively or positively is a sin, as well as murdering Bodies, as many undertaking and not-performing Pastors will find.

10. I believe that he that obeyeth not a Law which was made against Gods Law, or without Authority given by him, sinneth not against Authority.

11. I think in such cases, he that submitteth to the Penalty of a penal Law, doth enough.

12. I conjecture, that the multitude of Casuists, Politick Writers, and Lawyers, who say, that *Because the Common Good is the End of Government, and all Power is for Edification, no Law obligeth which is against the Common Good, or at least that is destructive of it,* are like to be near as knowing in such matter, as the *meanest* of the Doctors *Hearers* and *Readers.*

13. And I am past doubt, that he that denieth these Principles, will shortly have no cause to glory of his Wisdom.

And O what cause have we that are Teachers, instead of proving those intollerable that differ from us in such matters as our Conformity, to consider that an Errour in us, especially so practical and momentous, is far more dangerous than in the People. If all my Neighbours mistake my Disease and the Remedy, it may not hurt me; but if my Physician mistake it, it may be my death. Bishop *Usher* and many Protestants do except a learned Papist much more than the unlearned from the hopes of Salvation.

§. 12. I will readily Answer your Queries, though you refuse to Answer mine.

To your first, Those who rightfully give Orders, must give such Orders as God hath instituted, and may not limit or suspend contrary to his Institution or Laws. As he that marrieth persons may not except the Husbands power of Government, nor may unmarry them again, save for Adultery. None may silence Ministers that forfeit not their Office. On just cause to pull down Churches, and alienate the Church Goods, (as some Bishops of old did for the Poor) is no Sacriledge: nor to silence an intolerable Teacher: But to silence Ministers unjustly, is another matter.

If men will cant over still, *Who shall be Judge?* We still repeat, 1. Whoever is Judge, he hath no power to cast out faithful Ministers; and if he mis-judge them, it justifieth not his act. 2. And every man is the *discerning Judge of his own duty.*

§. 13. To your second Querie, Christian Magistrates may justly preserve the publick Peace by all just means, and may repress all rebellious Practices and Principles: but if they should *mis-judge* any Principles to be such that are not, and for not renouncing those should silence Ministers, if

they

they have fitter means than silencing to correct them, silencing them, when their Ministry is needful, is a sin.

But seeing these words are significant of your *mind for silencing us*, and the Reasons of it, why would you not tell *me*, *what those Principles are* which we refuse to renounce, and so deserve silencing. Either you lay the stress on *the guiltiness* of our *Principles*, or on the *Magistrates judging them so*. You cannot think that if he mis-judge it will justifie his silencing men: Else *Valens*, *Hunnichus*, that cut out the preachers Tongues, those that silenced the Preachers in *Germany*, on our side for not swearing for the Pope, and on the other for not swearing for the Emperour, *&c.* all did well. Seeing then you speak as an *Accuser of us*, *as guilty of refusing to renounce such principles*, and subscribe your implyed consent to our silencing for it: O that you would be so Charitable as to help our Conversion, and tell us what those Principles are. I have told the world at large my own and many other Principles of Government and obedience, in my second *Plea for Peace*: I crave your discovery of my errours therein: Yea, I provoke also such as more fiercely accuse as Plotters, or Cherrishing Principles of Rebellion, to name that Principle which I have not there renounced. If all that's there be not enough, I know not what will be enough.

§ 14. To your third, I answer, 1 It followeth not that *Authority to silence justly is to no purpose*, unless all *unjustly silencing* must be obeyed: The Apostles, the old Bishops, the most of the Churches have disobeyed such; as did the *Waldenses*, *Bohemians*, *Germane* Protestants, the *French*, *Belgians*, *Remonstrants*, and *Contraremonstrants*, &c. You say, *greatness of Parishes* makes no difference: What if the King turned all *London* into one Parish, and so forbid all preaching and Publick worship to all, save a few thousand? Is Authority vain unless all the rest turn like to *Atheists*? No good Christian should obey the Popes Interdicts of whole Kingdoms, though he had as much Authority as the King: A power to damn souls is a frightful word.

2. Either the supposition that it *is unjust*, is *true* or *false*: If false, it will not justifie their preaching: *If true*, either his preaching is necessary or unnecessary. If it be *Necessary*, we must obey God, and disobey man, (as *Grosthead* saith by *an obedient disobedience*). If it be *unnecessary*, though the Magistrate sin, I must forbear there, and go to some place, where I may Preach without doing more hurt than good: So that all our controversie lyeth but in this, *whether the preaching of the* 2000 *silenced Ministers was unnecessary, and tended to do more hurt than good*. And this is all that Mr. *Rathband*, or any sober Nonconformist meant: And this is plain truth though the best of your Hearers, and Readers, or your self Contradict it.

§. 15. And whereas you say: *This I am certain is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformists of former times*, your assertion is so rash and false in matters of notorious Fact, that it weakneth my reverence of your Judg-

ment

ment in matter of right. I have told you what Bishop *Baneroft* saith of the old Nonconformists forming Churches and Discipline: The Canon against Conventicles, thence occasioned, confuteth you: I have heard old Nonconformists preach constantly publickly and privately against Law: I was familiar with many of them: I never knew one of the mind you mention. Most of them did preach themselves that ever I heard of. If Mr. *Rathband* had denied this, it had been no proof. Mr. *Ash* that is one of them there, and Mr. *Slater*, both peached at *Bremicham* long, Mr. *Pateman* at *Moseley* nearer Multitudes I could name. And yet a man that knew them not [*is certain that all the Nonconformists of former times had contrary Doctrine*]. I was in 1638. and 1639. accounted one of them, though I used the Liturgie, which most of them did not. I knew them better than you did. I have named many in my first Plea, whose Practice proveth your great Error in that History where you say you are certain.

§. 16. To your fourth Question, An Obligation may be called [*the same*], 1. *Quoad terminum.* 2. *Quoad gradum.* 3. *Quoad modum obligandi.* 4. *Quoad realitatem.*

1. The Apostles had an obligation to assert *Christs Resurrection, as eye-witnesses*, and to *record his Doctrine and Laws infallibly in Scripture*, and to many things proper to them, which we have not; But we are obliged to the work of our proper Office.

2. The Apostles had greater obligations than we, by more immediate Call, and special gift of the Spirit, and special Commission and Command; when ours are lower, but firmly binding us.

3. The Apostles were obliged by *Christs immediate mission*, and *Commission*; and we but by his *ordinary instituted means*: But we are as *truly* bound to our Duty, as they to theirs.

2. And our Duty is to preach the Gospel to those without, and those within, according to our power and opportunity, and to do the rest of our Office when we can. And though we are called to this without supernatural Inspiration, Vision, or Miracle, *being called*, we are as truly obliged, as Parents, Husbands, Princes are to their Duties. It is not lawful to look back when we have put our hands to *Christs* Plow, nor perfidiously to break our Ordination Vow, nor to be negligent or treacherous Non-residents, Pluralists, or slothful, nor to obey men more than God, though we were not called immediately, or by Miracle.

3. If the Magistrate appoint 20000 or 1000, or one half a Parish to be excluded for want of Room and Teachers, it's ill supposed that the *Gospel* is *truly and sufficiently preached to them*, to whom it is not preached at all. And that it is preached to *others*, proveth it not unnecessary to *them*.

4. He that only *readeth the Gospel truly preacheth it*: But Souls have need of more Pastoral help than bare *true preaching*.

5. Ignorant wicked men in *England* can no more be saved than Heathens, and

and have need of convincing, skilful, serious Preaching, as well as they.

Your wondring at our allegation of the Apostles words, and great confidence in so sad a Cause, fers me almost above wondering at any thing that you say. *Timothy* was not called immediately by *Christ*, who had that dreadful Charge to preach *in season and out of season*. The Universal Church long judged otherwise of this case than you do: And not only Bishop *Bilson*, but I think almost all Christian Writers, Protestants and Papists, herein follow the ancient Church against you. The Nonconformists and others easily grant what I said before, That no *one Apostle might be silenced* by man; but *undeserving Ministers, that do more hurt than good by their Ministry*, may be silenced by Christian Magistrates: But not the Churches Edification oppugned, and 2000 faithful men silenced for not sinning on pretence of a power to judge or execute.

§. 17. My Question implieth, 1. That every man is most concerned for his own Soul, and hath a *prior* obligation to secure it, which the King cannot dispense with. 2. And, That every man hath nearer helps to know what is good or hurtful to his Soul in doubtful Cases, than the King that never saw him hath. 3. And every man is like to love himself more than the King loveth him. 4. And, That the King can no more bind him to hurt, or famish, or endanger his Soul than his Health in Diet.

But the King must give men all the helps that he can, and set up and maintain sufficient publick Teachers, and drive the ignorant and prophane to hear and learn, and promote Order and Concord, and hinder Unpeaceableness and Disorder by just means. But I have so fully declared the Magistrate's Work in my Book of Concord, that I will not repeat it on this slight occasion. Separations must be prevented by right means. I had no Separatists in a great Congregation for fourteen years, though many Sects strongly and often tempted them; no not one Separate Meeting all that time, and this without force. What harm will it do me, or them, if my Hearers go from me (as you say) to Dr. *O*? Our whole Country where I lived almost kept Concord, and kept out Separation without the Magistrates constraint: Experience is not easily confuted. Why then do you tell me of *what I have written against Separation?* when you may see that I contradict none of this; and when that *writing*, with my other Endeavours, served without the Rulers Sword. I had there Justices always at hand that would have done for me what they could at any time: I never desired one act of force from them. I allowed Quakers and Anabaptists publick Disputes half a day together: They never won one Man or Woman by it. Mr. *Tombes* his great Parts, and Interest with his Flock and Kindred, could get but about twenty four or less than thirty Anabaptists at *Bewdeley*: Almost all the rest of the Country was free, save a few inconsiderable Quakers at *Worcester*, and a small Village or two. The like was then done without force in many other Counties.

§. 18. I

§. 18. I told you how neceſſary the reſolving of the Queſtions which I ſent you was to my Conviction: And I will not provoke you, by giving that name to *your denial of an Anſwer to them*, which I think impartial Readers will give it.

I. Will other men believe that he doth well to deny me the definition of that National Church which he writeth of, or to tell me *whether he ſpeak of a Lay or a Clergy Government*, who writes his wonder that I ſhould ſay, *I know not what they mean by the National Church?* How can I know whom to obey, or when I ſeparate from the Form of Government, if I know not what it is? Is this nothing to our Caſe? I take my ſelf to be more bound to obey the King, than ſome Biſhops. You knew that you are here divided as for two Church-forms among your ſelves.

II. Would any man that ever knew you have believed that ever you, even you, ſhould have ſo preached and written for *walking by the ſame Rule*, and accuſed the Nonconformiſts as worthy of ſilencing, and as intollerable for ſwarving from that Rule; and when you have done, will by no intreaty be prevailed with ſo much as to tell me *what that Rule is*, *Dvine* or *Humane*, the *Statutes* or the *Canons*, or what? yea, and think this impertinent to the buſineſs?

III. Was it not almoſt incredible, that when all this was ſaid and written againſt our Separation, that I cannot intreat you to tell me *what Separation is*, even what is the formal Reaſon from whence you ſo name it, and whether you make it not to be the ſame with [*Diſobedience*], contrary to the common ſenſe of Church-Writers?

IV. Is it not hard to have been believed, that when I and others are ſo loudly accuſed of preaching (though I never gathered a Church) to ſome of many thouſands that cannot come into the Temples, (many of which never heard a Sermon of many years) that I cannot entreat you to tell me *what all thoſe thouſands ſhould do on the Lords day, and how you would have them ſpend the time*: And that this ſhould be taken as impertinent? The Canon commandeth the ſpending of the Sunday and Holidays in hearing Gods Word, *&c.* Doth he keep this better that goeth to *no Church*, or he that heareth ſuch as I?

Let the Reader alſo peruſe the reſt, and ſee whether they are impertinent.

§. 19. Before you deſired me, I have long weighed with my moſt ſerious and impartial thoughts, the matter of this Controverſie: And I had great reaſon ſo to do, when for the labour which you account my ſin, I wear my Health and Fleſh, I ſuffer reproach, and many a thouſand Pounds Loſs and Damage, in theſe nineteen years; and being weary of a burdenſom Body, do bear it and live eſpecially for that work. And if I do and ſuffer all this for ſin, to the wrong of the Church, and the hazard of my Soul, alas, what a caſe am I in! when no Study, no Prayer, no reſolved contempt

tempt of all mens censure, and of worldly Interests, in twenty years time, yea in *forty one* (for so long I have been partly a Nonconformist) can change my Judgment, or make me doubt? Lord, shew me thy Truth, and make me true to it, whatever it cost me; and teach us all to know what manner of spirit we are of, and acquaint us with the true way of Christian Piety, Love, and Peace. *June* 17. 1680.

To the Reverend Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, *Dean of* St. Pauls, &c.

Richard Baxter *returneth this Account of his Doctrine and Practice, which by his published Sermon, preached before the Lord Mayor,* May 2. 1680. *he often calleth me to; and the Lord Mayors and Court of Aldermens earnest desire of his Printing it, add to my Obligation.*

§. 1. SIR, I apprehend much Reason for my rendring you this following Account, and some against it: And it was not easie to me quickly to resolve which did preponderate. It is easie to foresee, that the Papists will be glad that your Pen be turned from them, against those whom they are most against, and will laugh to see you diverted by such a Scuffle. And Satan knowing our frailty, will hope to perswade you, that all that is said against the weakness and errour of your Writings, is against *your Interest and you*, and so to stir up in you Passions and Thoughts directly contrary to Love and Concord, and your own and the Publick good: For with some he hath unhappily succeeded to carry them from one Error to another, till he hath brought them to the bitter hatred of their Confuters. And though I am not so considerable as you, the Tempter disdaineth not so low a Game, as to try whether he can make your erroneous opposition a snare to me. When I saw that you had begun this contentious way, it was easie to foresee that Satans Cause was like to gain by it, and therefore I fear that he was much the cause.

§. 2. And I remembred *Prov.* 17. 14. *The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water; therefore leave off contention before it be medled with.*] And if you could not forbear *beginning*, you will hardly forbear when a necessary Confutation seemeth to dishonour you. *Interest*, you tell me, is *strong*; and it's easier to speak against selfish Partiality, than to overcome it. I never personally provoked you, unless it was by confuting your Opinion, [*That no Form of Church-Government is of Divine Institution*] in my *Christian Directory*: But as I named you not, unless with honour, so your own accusing of that *Irenicon* of yours, (otherwise a very laudable Book) doth seem to justifie what I said.

§. 3. And I truly fear, lest the opening of your misdoings should rejoyce the Papists, and encourage them to say, *This is the Champion against the Catholicks.*] For I speak from my heart in my usual saying to them that mention

you, That this Kingdom is greatly beholden to you, for your seasonable and open defence of the Protestant Cause, at a time when———— And I am glad that you blame them that accuse the Conformable Clergy of yieldingness to Popery; which implieth, that no Bribe shall tempt you, directly or indirectly, to serve that Cause, how strongly soever it shall seem supported by the Arm of Flesh.

§. 4. But yet in so publick a Cause, to be by your Accusations so loudly called to be accountable for my Doctrine and Practice, and that to the Magistrate, and to an End easily discernable, and to refuse to tender you or the Magistrate any just satisfaction, when refusing may make me and thousands more taken for *Guilty*, as by our (silent) Confession, and consequently the Magistrate and you to incur a far greater guilt, if you should mistake, this seemeth to me a Crime not to be ventured on: When you have made answering *necessary*, I must answer. Else I should have imitated *Melanthon*, who oft boasteth how much he had profited in Philosophy, so that he could silently let *Illiricus*, *Osiander*, and such others, write and talk against him. If possible, and as much as in us lieth, we should live peaceably with all men: But when that which men make impossible to us is no Duty, nor the want of it a Sin, though an affliction, the Aggressor doth make Defence a Duty. And indeed I must be guilty of Scandal against you and others, if I deny you satisfaction. Either I or you live in no small sin: Though Mr. *Cheyney* think otherwise, your words, and many such others, shew, that you take our course to be a sin intollerable. And if it should prove that the sin is yours, it could not be small, not only to do what we fear would be so bad in us, but also to accuse us so publickly to Magistrates, for not forbearing to preach the Gospel, when we were solemnly devoted to it; and pleading against the toleration of it, when non-toleration must be by Imprisonment, Banishment, or Death, or such disablement, against such as believe they are bound to preach while they are able.

§. 5. Yet you can tell that they *are ill men* that *reported you stir up Magistrates to Persecution.* If that much will prove it, it's like they will be emboldened to call you [*an ill man*] too; For such faults are so common that we may say as *Seneca* [*Quid Ulcus leviter tangam omnes mali sumus,*] Indeed they do not well that use that word, *Persecution*: When your words are but against *Toleration*, and *the Church of* Englands *endeavour after Uniformity*; which are publickly known.

§. 6. And no wonder if they are *ill men*; when you are but *finding out a certain Foundation for a lasting union, which is impossible to be attained till men are convinced of the Evil and danger of the present Separation, &c.* That is, you are but proving our union impossible: For I have elsewhere proved that the conviction which you speak of is morally impossible, to become the terms of a common Union. It is impossible that we should all be convinced that none of the particulars imposed are sinful, which I have named

med in my first *Plea*: And 2. It is as impossible that we should all be convinced that it is any more Lawful for us to forsake our Ministry, to which we were vowed in our Ordination, than to break our Oath of Allegiance, and deny our Duty to the King: So that you do no worse than for Union to prove our Union impossible; and who is it that makes it so?

§. 7. And this Impossibility you infer from this Principle, [*That it is lawful to separate on a pretence of greater Purity, where there is an agreement in Doctrine, and the substantial parts of Worship.*]

Answ. 1. Was there not this Agreement in the case of *Cyprian* and the Council, who perswade the People to separate from *Martiall* and *Basilides*? And is not Union possible with such as *Cyprian* and the *Carthage* Bishops?

2. We that are accused by you do not say that [*we differ not from you in Doctrine absolutely*:] *viz.* in the Doctrine about *Diocesan Church-forms*, or their *Imposing Power*. we never denied *this difference*. But we say, [*In the Doctrine of the* 39 *Articles*] as distinct from the Form of Government, and imposed Abuses, we agree: And suppose that we agreed in such Doctrine and Worship with a Church that yet held only that the *Pope is jure divino the Constitutive Vicarious Head of the Universal Church*, and would take none that confess it not for Christians; were it not a sin to separate from that Church?

3. Suppose that Usurpers should thrust out the Bishops and you, and make themselves our Pastors against our wills, is it unlawful to separate from them, though they agree with us in Doctrine and Worship? And if the Churches and Councils have been in the right, which for 700 yea 1000 years held that the calling of a Bishop was null that had not the Clergies Election, and the Peoples Election or Consent. I need not tell you how far this will reach.

4. What if a Church that you agree with in Doctrine and Worship will not receive you, unless you will deliberately profess or subscribe an Untruth, or covenant against some Duty, or commit a known sin; is it intollerable for you rather to separate from them than to sin? And must we have no Union till we can in all things think as you do?

§. 8. I think you need not expect the Censures of the chief *makers of our Divisions*: And as to the *inferiour Sectaries*, if you are a *Sacrifice*, it will be an *unbloody* one. You well admonish us in the end not to complain too much when we are silenced, impoverished, and imprisoned: The counsel is good; But for the Dean of *Pauls*, *&c.* that is deservedly loved and honoured by us all whom you thus deal with, and by those great men whose esteem he deservedly more valueth, while he liveth in this plenty and honour, to call himself [*a Sacrifice*] if a few poor men say *He wrongeth them*, when he pleadeth against the Magistrates enduring them, or against their judgment that think they should be endured, doth not this seem to another greater tendency, than for me only to say *de facto*, *I was laid in the Common Gaol, and fain*

to make away my Goods and Library to save them from Distress.] But so much to your Epistle: The Sermon followeth.

§. 9. And what could a Man have desired more to end the main differences among us, than the serious consideration of your Text in its very plain import and drift.

1. That the text speaketh for Unity and Concord is past question. 2. And that it speaketh both to the Pastors and the Flocks. 3. And that it speaketh to *all Christians*; though of various degrees of Attainment: And therefore requireth all to live in Concord that are Christians; notwithstanding other differences. 4. All the doubt is what is meant by the same *Canon or Rule*: And there are these several Expositions pleaded for.

1. That by *the same Rule is meant* only the General Concord *idem velle & nolle*; to agree, and live in *Peace*, and *to mind the same things*.

2. That by the *same Rule* is meant the Essentials of Christianity received by all Christians; which they should have concordantly Practiced, notwithstanding other differences.

3. That by the same Rule is meant the Doctrine which the Apostles had concordantly delivered to all the Churches.

4. That it was the Churches Creed which is supposed then to be in use, as the symbol of Christians.

5. That it is the Canonical Scriptures, in the times that they were written and delivered to the Churches.

6. That it is the Example of S. *Paul* before described, or the matter of it; that is, to hold fast what he had attained, and press forwards towards the heavenly perfection, by desire, hope, diligence, and patience.

7. Some take the [*one Rule*] to be [*the end* as it is to be attained by the *means*:] that is, the *common good* of the *Church*, and furtherance of the Gospel and our salvation: *Let all be done to edification.*

8. Some say that it is the great duty of Love which is made the Rule for our undetermined actions; or, that the fundamental duties are made a Canon to the Superstructures, as it seemeth to be meant, *Gal.* 6. 15, 16. And by Christ, *Go learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not Sacrifice.* To tell you *which* and *how many* of these I take to be meant in the Text, and *why*, is none of the work which you call me to; but to tell you, that which-ever of these it is, or if all these, we fully consent: All these Canons we must all walk by.

9. But some say that by the *same Rule* is meant the *Tradition* and *Custom* of the *Universal Church.*

10. And some that it is the Canons of the Bishops in General Councils; and under them, in National or Provincial Councils.

11. And some tell us that the Rule of Christian concord is [*Obedience to the Bishops of all the world* (or Universal Church) *who are a College Governing*

(not

(not only *divisim & per partes*, in their several Precincts, but) unitedly as *One* Regent College, ordinarily *per literas formatas*, and by General Councils when they sit.

12. And some tell us that it is the Law or Will of the Civil Christian Magistrate which is this Rule.

As to these four last Rules we must put in our Exceptions. As to the 9th, the Traditions and Customs then in use were Apostolical Institutions, and so are coincident with some of the former: But other Traditions and Customs we take not for this Rule.

And as to the tenth, we give Councils, though wrongfully called *General*, their due honour; as we do to inferiour Councils, and every particular Pastor in his place: but take not this for the Rule here mentioned.

And as to the 11th, we know of no such Government in being.

And as to the 12th, it was not then existent, and therefore could not be that meant in the Text: But we take our selves bound to obey Magistrates, as we have elsewhere at large explained and professed.

In short, either you think it is a *Divine* or a *Humane Rule* or *Law* which is here meant, or both: If a *Divine*, we shall not differ from you of any thing, unless it be of the meaning of it. If a *Humane*, either it is an act of true Power received from God, or not: If not, you will grant us that it obligeth us not as this Rule in question: If yea, then we agree that we are to obey it: So that all that will be useful to our Conviction will be, 1. That you prove the Persons authorized to their Office (and of our Magistrates there is no doubt.) 2. And that they have authority to make all the Canons and Laws which you call the Rule. And without this your labour is all lost to us.

§. 10. But which of all these it is that you take for the Rule meant in your Text, we must conjecture: 1. You well say, *p.* 11. [*It was such a Rule which they very well knew, which he had given them before.*] Therefore it was none that was not then in being, but to be made by Bishops afterward. And, *p.* 14. you seem to include the Canon made *Act.* 15. whatever the sense of this Text is, we willingly also stand to that; and to the Holy Ghosts decision, that nothing be imposed but *necessary things*. And, *p.* 15. I find you say [*that the preserving the peace of the Church, and preventing separation, was the great measure according to which the Apostle gave his directions.*] And this is all that I can find of your determination *what is that Rule*. And if *Peace* be the Rule, we all agree with you in declaiming against the violation of it. But is there no more in your Application?

§. 11. I remember it is said in the Life of *Joh. Bugenhagius Pomeranus* (the Pastor of the Church in *Wittenberge*, and the Presbyter that ordained the Bishops and Presbyters of *Denmark*, and many other places) how much *Joh. Frederick* the Elector of *Saxony* was pleased to hear him open the Reasons why Magistrates have power to make Laws, but not Pastors [*armatam esse potestatem politicam authoritate condendi leges, non pugnantes cum Decalogo; &*

de

de his traditam se verissimum præceptum; necesse est obedire propter conscientiam: sed pastoribus expresse prohiberi condere proprias leges, cum dicatur, Nemo vos arguat in cibo, in potus nec posse hanc libertatem ullius creaturæ authoritate tolli.] But I had rather stretch my Obedience to the utmost consistent with Conscience and Obedience to God, than speak for any needless Liberty.

§. 12. It is certain, that by [*the same Rule*] is not meant, 1. Any Rule that tied Christians to subscribe or declare that there is nothing in our three Books, (Liturgy, Ordination, and Articles) contrary to the Word of God: For none of them were then extant, nor are they 200 years old. 2. Nor any Rule that tied them to any one humane Liturgy which all the Churches in the Nation must agree in: For there was none such. 3. Nor was it any Rule that imposed on them any dubious unnecessary Opinions, Covenants, or Practises; nor, in a word, our *Conformity*, or any like it.

This is easily proved: 1. Because the Rule which they were all to walk by, was somewhat then existent. 2. It was a Divine Rule. 3. It was that which all Christians were to have concord in: But experience telleth us, that all *Christians* (that is, that consent to the Essentials of Christianity) never had, nor can have their Concord in any of the forementioned Conformity, as I have proved in my Book of Concord.

§. 13. We will go therefore no further than your Text for the Terms of our Agreement, and for our Defence against your Accusation: *Whatever you will prove to us*, by any such evidence as should *convince a man of reason and impartiality, to have been* THE RULE *which the Apostle did here mean*, and bid all that are Christians walk by, *we earnestly desire to agree thereto:* And we will joyn with you against any that refuse it. It will be a way more congruous to your Function, and cheaper to your Consciences, to condescend to these Terms, and prove to us what this *same Rule* was, than to tell the Magistrates that it is no sin not to endure us.

§. 14. *Pag.* 16, 17, 18, 19. you come to tell us what Separation it is not which you speak of; *viz. not of the Separation or distinct Communion of whole Churches from each other, &c. Ans.* You know it's like your self what you meant by these words; if you would have us know it, I must crave your Answer to these Questions.

Qu. 1. *Do you make* Separation *and* distinct Communion *the same thing, or divers?*

Qu. 2. *What distinction of Communion is it that you mean? When there are so many things which may distinguish? 1. Communion in distinct places you take not for Separation. 2. Nor Communion under distinct Presbyters or Bishops. 3. Therefore I suppose neither under distinct Princes, or Aristocracies in Cities, as such. 4. Nor under distinct Laws (meerly as such) of the same Prince. 5. Nor distinct in allowed or indifferent accidents. Why any of these should be called* Separation *I know not, unless as the word doth signifie but Diversity or Distance.*

Q. 3. *Do you take Separation here in the same sence as before and after; or Equivocally? If Equivocally, why did you not tell us what you here meant; besides the difference of Subjects: If univocally, then*

Qu. 4.

Q. 4. *Is not the Separation of whole Churches, much worse than of single Persons from one Church, when it is upon unwarrantable Cause, or Reasons, If one Church unjustly renounce Communion with another whole Church as no true Church or as Heretical, I think that it is done by a* whole Church *against a* whole Church *makes it worse.*

But perhaps you mean that for two National Churches to have two Kings is not unlawful. No doubt of that: But to what purpose is it? Or is it that two National Churches may have different accidents of Worship, or Discipline? And so may two *Diocesane*, or Parish-Churches in our Nation, if the King please at least.

§. 15. You add: *Which according to the Scripture, Antiquity and Reason have a just Right and Power to Govern and reform themselves. Ans.* Have not all *Diocesane* Churches Power to Govern and Reform themselves?

Government is of various species: Only the King, or *Summa potestas Civilis* hath Power to Govern and Reform by *his Species* of Government: But every Bishop may Govern and Reform his Church as a Bishop; as every Master may his Family as a Master, and every Man himself as a Man. It's a strange Man, Family, or Church that hath not Power to Govern and Reform it self; though not *Regal Power*: Though *Kings* have Power, they have not *Gods Power*: And all Power that is *Humane*, is not *Regal*.

§. 16. Serm. [*By whole Churches I mean the Churches of such Nations which upon the decay of the Roman Empire resumed their right of Government to themselves, and upon their owning Christianity, incorporated into one Christian Society, under the same common Tyes and Rules of Order and Government.*]

Ans. 1. And had not those as good right that were not under the *Roman* Empire? (as *Abasia*, *&c.*) 2. Did the Churches under the *Roman* Power exercise their great diversity in Liturgies and other accidents of Worship without right? Had not they a right to govern and reform themselves variously as they did? 3. *Christian Societies* are of divers *species*: Do you mean Christian Civil Societies, Kingdoms, free Cities, *&c.* or *Churches*? Or do you take a *Christian Kingdom* and a *Christian Church* for the same, as the *Erastians* do? If so, I suppose half the Conformists will be against you, as well as I. At least you must confess, that if *de nomine* a Christian Kingdom *quatale* may be called *a Church*, it is equivocally; and that there is a sort of *Christian Churches* which are of another Constitution. Far were the Christian Bishops for 1300 years from believing that a Prince or Civil Power was essential to a Christian Church, or that a Church in the common sense was not constituted of another sort of Regent part, that had the Power of the Keyes. Two *species* of Goverhours make two *species* of the Societies, if they are not subordinate, but prime constitutive Parts: But the Prince and the Pastor are two *species*, well opened among many by Bishop *Bilson* of Subjectio

jection. And verily if you Conformists be divided among your selves about the very Constitutive Rector of a Christian Church, you differ more from each other than we do from the generality of you. 4. And what be the *common Tyes* and *Rule* of *Order* which you mean? Are these notifying Terms for a Definition? 1. There are divine unalterable Rules of Order and Government, and there are humane Rules about alterable Accidents. 2. There are Rules made by Contract (such as *Grotius* thinks Canons are), and Rules made by Governours, which are binding Commands or Laws. 3. There are Rules made by Civil Governours to be enforced by the Sword, and Rules made only by Ecclesiastical Pastors to be executed only by the Power of the *Word* and *Keys*. Do you mean all these? Or which of them?

1. All Christian Churches are tied by the common Divine Rule; and is not consent to that enough to make a Church? 2. Churches of various Nations may be under one Humane Rule of Agreement or Contract. 3. The same Princes may give divers Rules about Accidents to the Churches of one Kingdom, and also the same Rule for some Accidents to divers Churches under them who differ in other greater things: And doth agreement in those Accidents do more to make them *One Church*, than their difference in Integrals to make them many? 4. Princes may do as the *Roman* Emperours long did; leave the Bishops in Councils to make their own Rules by consent, and make no common Imperial Rule for them: Are they ever the less One Church? 5. The *Roman* Empire and Councils both left the several Bishops to make Rules for Liturgies and other Accidents for their several Churches: Were they therefore the less One National Church?

W So that I am no more acquainted by your words what you mean by a *Whole Church*, than if you had said nothing. There is a *whole Diocesan Church*, and a *whole Parish Church*, as well as a *whole National Church*: And what the Power is, and what the Rule of Order must be, whether the Laws of Prince or Prelates, and whether about Essentials, or Integrals, or Accidents, and what Accidents, whether all, or many, or few, and which, that must make a Church to be *One whole Church*, you never tell us. An Infidel Prince or a Heretick Prince may give the same Rule of Order to his Christian Subjects in a whole Kingdom; Is he therefore the constitutive Church-Head? or will you say as your Mr. *Ri. Hooker* doth, that *If he be the Head of a Christian Church, it is necessary that he be a Christian?* To tell us of [*Common Ties and Rules of Order*] and never tell us what those Ties and Rules are, may serve your Ends, but not my Edification.

§. 17.

Eq
the

§. 17. But I remember your *Irenicum* learnedly maintaineth that God hath instituted no one form of Church Government as necessary: And if so, then not a National Church Form. And is it not *a whole Church if it be without a Form*, which not God but Man is the Author of? Then God made or instituted no such thing as a *whole Church*. Then it is a humane Creature. Then why may not man make yet more Forms; and multiply, and make and unmake, as he seeth Cause, and several Countries have several Forms. And *forma dat nomen & esse*: And if God made not any *whole Church*, we should be acquainted, who they be (that were not a Church) that had Power to make the first Church Form; and who hath the Power ever since; and how it's proved, and how it cometh to be any great matter to Separate from a Church Form which God never made; and whether humane Church Forms be not essential and Constitutive Causes of the Churches; and whether every commanded Oath, Subscription, Declaration, Office or Ceremony, be an essential part of this Church Form: And there be as many Church Forms, and Species, as there be Orders, Liturgies, and Ceremonies. And all these differences in the same Kingdom, constitute so many Schismes, and Separations.

§. 18. Do you take all the Christians in the *Turkish* Empire to be one National Church or not? If not, then one Head or humane Law is not necessary to the being or Government of a Church; nor is it necessary that it be National: And do you think that the *Greek* Churches have not Power to Govern and Reform themselves; though they be not a National Church. Why did *Paul* write to *Corinth* (as *Clemens* also did) and to the *Galatians*, &c. and *John* to *Ephesus*, and the other six, *Rev.* 2. & 3. to reform themselves, if they had not Power to do it. But if all the Christians under the *Turk*, be one National Church, then it is either because they have one Civil Head, or one Ecclesiastical Head. Not the latter, for they have none such; though the Bishop of *Constantinople* have some *Primacy* by their old Canons and Custom. Not the former, for an Infidel cannnot be an essential part of a Christian Church (as a Constitutive Head is.)

§. 19. And the Churches in the *Roman* Empire before *Constantine*, were true Churches of Christ's Institution: And they had power to Govern and reform themselves; And yet they had no humane Constitutive Head, Regal or Sacerdotal, though they had a Civil Heathen Governour, which was an extrinsick accidental Head.

It is so contrary to all sence and religion, that either a man as a man, or a family, or a Church as such, should have no power to govern and reform it self, that I must needs judge that while you speak confusedly, you meant only a Regal or Supream Civil power, which yet is *tota specie* distinct from that which is properly Ecclesiastical.

§. 20. Serm. p. 17. [*And so the several Churches of the* Lydian *or Proconsular* Asia, *if they had been united in one Kingdom, and Governed by the same authority under the same rules, might have been truly called the* Lydian *Church.*]

Answ. 1. And is the controversie *de nomine*, *Whether they might be called the* Lydian *Church*; when we expected a satisfactory explication *de re*? No doubt but a *Church* is so equivocal a word that many sort of Assemblies or Societies may be so called: I have told you of divers senses in which we are called a *Church National*, first *Plea*, p. 251, *&c.* Either a *Christian Kingdom*, or else the Churches of a Heathen or Christian King as *Associated by agreement*, may be called a *National Church.*

2. What if they be united in one Kingdom, of a Heathen, *Mahometan*, or *Arian* King, and Governed by his Regal authority, under the *same rules* which he sets them? Is this it that you mean in your description? A King as such is not an *Ecclesiastick person*: and therefore is not an essential part of a Church, unless as it is equivocally so called: And is it his *Civil Laws* for Church-Government, that you mean, or the *Clergies Canons*, or *God's Laws*? The *Greeks* under the *Turk* are under one Prince, and Governed by the same Civil authority and Laws, and also are under one Patriarch, and by the Princes toleration are Governed by the Ecclesiastick authority and Laws, of another Species: If you confound these two Species, or tell us not which you mean in your definition, it tendeth not to edification.

3. And what if they be under divers Kings (as the *Bulgarians* and *Greeks* were) and yet ruled by one *Ecclesiastick* Authority, and Law? why may not they also be called *One Church* (As the *Moscovites* are now called part of the *Greek Church*?)

4. And why might it not be called the *Lydian Church* while it was a part of the Empire? as the *African* and other Countries were? But what is all this *de nomine* to the Controversie? All grant that the Civil power must be obeyed in their place, and the Church power in theirs?

But 5.

5. But here you grant that *they are ſeveral Churches* before their Union in one Kingdom. And I ſuppoſe they were Churches, 1. of another ſpecies than the *National* deſcribed by you, 2. and were of *Divine* Inſtitution; 3. and continue ſo after their Union in one Kingdom; 4. and have power to govern and reform themſelves ſtill, though not Regal power.

§. 21. Serm. '[*Juſt as ſeveral Families united make one Kingdom, which* 'at firſt *had a diſtinct and independent power: but it would make ſtrange con-* 'fuſion *in the World to reduce Kingdoms back again to Families, becauſe at firſt* 'they *were made up of them.*]

Anſw. And are they not ſeveral Families ſtill? and have they not ſtill a diſtinct *Family-power* to govern and reform themſelves, tho not a *Regal Power?* Doth making a City or Kingdom diſſolve Families? You cannot mean it. What mean you then by *reducing theſe Kingdoms back to Families*, when they are Families ſtill? Had you ſaid, that *diſſolving Kingdoms or Cities*, and *reducing them to be only Families* is confuſion, it's undeniable. But ſtill as Families in a Kingdom retain *Family-power*, ſo particular Churches in a Kingdom retain the Church-power which God by his Inſtitution gave them. And this is that we deſire.

§. 22. Serm. '[*Thus National Churches are National Societies of Chriſtians* 'under *the ſame Laws of Government and Rules of Worſhip.*]

Anſ. 1. All Chriſtians are under the ſame *Divine Laws* and *Rules.* 2. Some Princes make no Church-Laws to Chriſtians, but their Civil Laws for the common Peace. And ſome make various Laws for various ſorts of Chriſtians under them.

§. 23. Serm. '[*For the true Notion of a Church is no more than a Society of* 'Men, *united together for their Order and Government according to the Rules of the* 'Chriſtian *Religion.*

Anſ. 1. There be many true Notions of ſuch an equivocal word as a [*Church*] is. 2. The *Generical Notion* ſure is not enough for the definition of each *ſpecies.* There muſt be more. The Univerſal Church is a *Society of Men ſo united*; and ſo may the Churches of divers Kingdoms; and ſo is a Chriſtian Kingdom as ſuch; and ſo is a Provincial *Church*, and a Dioceſan *Church*, and a particular Parochial *Church:* yet all theſe are not of the ſame *ſpecies*, for they have different *terminos in ſpecie.* 3. This is a very defective Definition, where 1. [*Men*] are made the *qualified Subject*, when it ſhould have been [*Chriſtians*]. 2. The two conſtitutive eſſential Relations of *Paſtor* and *Flock* are not mentioned, as if a Kingdom were defined without the mention of *King* and *Subjects.* 3. They are ſaid to be *united* in general, without telling us what uniting is meant, whether only by *force*, *command*, or *conſent*; whereas moſt take even the Mode of Inveſtiture (*Baptiſm*) as well as *Conſent* to be neceſſary *ad eſſe*, as to the *Viſible Church.* 4. It is ſaid they

are united [*for Order and Government*,] as if these were but the *Terminus*; and so may those by agreement *de futuro*, that yet have no Government: whereas the Government is the *constitutive* Form. 5. This Definition leaving out the *specifick Form* and *Terminus*, maketh an Army, a Navy, a Ship, a company of *Christian Merchants*, or *Corporation*, &c. to be a *Church*: For all these may be '*Societies of Men united together for their Order and Government*, '*according to the Rules of the Christian Religion*: For the *Christian Religion* giveth Rules to all sorts of *Christian Societies*. These are not the usual ways of defining, nor give me any true notice of your sence. 6. And you make it not intelligible, whether by the *Rules* of the *Christian Religion* you mean only the *Divine Rule*? and whether you mention it as the *uniting Bond*, or only as a *Rule* to some *humane Rule*? But though the application look this way, yet your words speak no more than what is common to the *Churches* which you accuse, that are [*united for Order and Government according to the Rules of the Christian Religion*]. If this will serve, those are thus united that take the Bible for their Rule of Order, &c. But is not this against those *Churches*, that take not the *Bible*, but *Canons*, or other humane Laws, for the bound of their *Church-Union*, or their Rule. If it be *uniting for Order and Government according to the Rules of the Christian Religion*, which maketh a *Church*, let us then try which Societies are so united, and let that be the matter of our Dispute.

§. 24. Serm. p. 13. '[*And it is a great mistake to make the Notion of a Church* '*barely to relate to Acts of Worship, and consequently that an adequate Notion of a* '*Church is an Assembly for Divine Worship; by which means they appropriate the* '*Name of Churches to particular Congregations: whereas if this held true, the* '*Church must be dissolved as soon as the Congregation is broken up. But if they re-* '*tain the nature of a Church when they do not meet together for Worship, then* '*there is some other Bond that uniteth them; and whatever that is, it constitutes* '*the Church.*

Ans. 1. Did you write this as a *Confutation* of any body? If so, you should have told them who are your Adversaries. I never met with one to my remembrance that saith, the *Church is no longer a Church than they are congregate*, but Mr. *Cheney* who writeth against my *Plea for Peace*. And so the two first who now write against me, write against one another, and I must please them both. When you so far differ among your selves, you should bear with them that less differ from you.

2. What mean you by the [*Notion of a Church*] which all Men know is an equivocal word? Do you mean that a [*Church*] hath but one *Notion*? I pray you tell us, whether the Notion be the same as it is used, *Matth.* 16. 18. & 18. 17. 1 *Corinth.* 11. 18, 22. *Acts* 19. 32, —— 39, 40. 1 *Crrinth.* 14. 34. *Psalm* 26. 5. *Ephes.* 5. 27. 1 *Tim.*

1 *Tim* 3. 15. *Acts* 5. 11. *Acts* 20. 28. *Rev.* 2. 12, 18. *Rom.* 16. 5. *Phil.* 2. 10. *Acts* 8. 1, 3. *Eph.* 5. 23. *Col.* 1. 18. *Eph.* 1. 22. & 5. 23. Doth any Man believe that it is in all these Texts taken in the same Notion (or sence)? I am sure I need not ask this of you as to the sence of prophane Authors, who use the word for any sort of *Concilium*, *cœtus*, *concio*, *congregatio*, *convivia*, as in *Lucan*, *Demosthenes*, *Aristotle*, *Thucidides*, &c.

3. If you will pardon me for telling Men in Print so often, that a *Church* is constituted not only for *Communion* in *Worship*, but also in *Doctrine*, and *holy Living*, I will not ask you, why you dissembled this? nor why you would intimate the contrary to your Readers? Repetition is not the least fault of my Writings, and all will not prevent the mis-intimations even of such worthy Men as you. *Ad nauseam usq;* I have repeated, that the Office of the Ministery standeth in a subordination to the three parts of *Christ*'s Office, Prophetical or Teaching, Priestly or Worshipping, Kingly or Ruling; and that a particular *Church* is associated for the use and benefit of all three conjunctly. Were you not willing to take notice of this? or not willing that others should take notice of it?

4. How many Writings of ours have told the World, that *we appropriate not the Notion of a Church to a particular Congregation.* Do not my Books which you cite, copiously express the contrary? Do we not over and over tell Men, that the word [*Church*] must be considered as *equivocal*, *generical*, and *specifical*? Do we take [*the Holy Catholick Church*] in the Creed for a *particular Congregation*? Worthy Sir, this is unworthy dealing, whether it be by ignorance, negligence, rashness or wilfulness. We distinguish between *Churches* of *God's Institution*, and of *Man's Invention.* And of the first sort, what *Independent* is there that holdeth not an *Universal Church* at least, besides particular Congregations? And of Man's making, who can number the sorts that are and may be made?

5. Did you ever know Man, (save such Conformists as he that answered my Plea) whether *Greek*, *Papist*, *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, or *Anabaptist*, who denieth a *Church Bond*, that uniteth them when the Congregation is dismiss'd. All confess, that the Union of the *pars regens* and *pars subdita* for *Church-ends* doth make it a *Church.* And who doth not distinguish between the *Constitution* and *Administration*, the *Status* and the *Exercitium*?

6. How then could you say, [*If this be true, the Church must be dissolved as soon as the Congregation is broken up*]? What shew is there of such a consequence? What if we held that the Church were so called barely in *relation* to *Publick Worship*? doth it follow that this Relation ceaseth as soon as the several Acts of Worship cease? Their mutual consent, and the union of the VVorshippers, Priest and People associated for that use, may con-

tinue when the Act of VVorſhip is intermitted. May it not continue a School, when the Boys go home or play? May it not be a Parliament when the Houſe is riſen, tho it be only for the work of aſſembled Men that they are related and denominated?

7. But Sir, do you not confeſs, even in your *Irænicon*, where you maintain that no Form of Church-Government is of Divine command: 1. That God hath commanded that there be *Aſſemblies* ordinarily uſed for his VVorſhip. 2dly. And that Paſtors are to be the Guides and chief Managers of this VVorſhip. 3dly, And that they ſhould be alſo their Teachers. 4thly, And that they govern them by their Keys. And if all this be true, then ſuch *Aſſemblies* are of Divine Inſtitution; not ſuch as are aſſociated only for VVorſhip, but for *Doctrine*, *Worſhip*, *and holy Living*, under the Teaching and Conduct of their Paſtors. If you deny that ſuch *Churches* as we call *Particular* are of Divine Inſtitution, we have often proved it, though few Chriſtians deny it, or need any proof.

And it is ſo oft repeated in the Books which you cite, that I muſt ſuppoſe you know it, though you ſeem to diſſemble it, that the Definition which I give of ſuch a Church doth make the *Terminus* to be (not the whole Church meeting at one time and place, but) *perſonal, preſential Communion* in Doctrine, VVorſhip, and Holy Converſation, as diſtinct from abſent Communion by Delegates or Letters only. Your Pariſh is aſſociated for ſuch *perſonal preſential Communion*, and yet they meet not all at once, but ſome one day, and ſome another, and ſome not at all, which is a fault *in exercitio*, but overthroweth not the being of the *Church*, while it is *perſonal preſent Communion* which they aſſociate for and profeſs, and that ſtates the *Church-relation*. And they meet not all in one place, but ſome in the Biſhop of *Ely*'s *Chappel*, (and it is pity but you had many more); and yet *Chappels* of Eaſe conſiſt with ſome Obligations on the whole Pariſh ordinarily, to have *per vices* ſometime *perſonal Communion* in the Pariſh-Church.

If you would have told us plainly, that Pariſh-Churches are no Churches, or that God never ordained ſuch ſingle Churches, as are aſſociated for *perſonal Communion* in Preſence, in Doctrine, VVorſhip, and Converſation, which have their proper Paſtors, we ſhould have known what to ſay to you. But if you deny not ſuch, (which we undertake fully to prove) plainly confeſs their *Conſtitution*, VVorth, and Privileges, and we ſhall readily next debate the Caſe with you, how far Men may aſſociate theſe into larger Churches of another *ſpecies*. But ſtill we ſay, that as *Families* ceaſe not to be Families, when they are combined into a *Village* or *City*; no more do *particular Churches* loſe their Conſtitution or Adminiſtration by being aſſociated into any lawful larger Churches.

§. 25.

§. 25. Serm. ‘[*And if there be one Catholick Church conſiſting of multitudes ‘of particular Churches, conſenting in one Faith; then why may there not be one ‘National Church from Conſent in the ſame Articles?* &c.]

Anſ. 1. I pray confeſs firſt, that your *National* doth conſiſt of a *multitude* of ſuch *particular Churches* of God's Inſtitution, and cannot deſtroy them or their Power and Privileges: Secondly; And once tell us what you mean by a *National Church*, whether Regal or Sacerdotal. If you mean a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, who denies it: If you mean all the Churches of a Kingdom aſſociated for Concord as Equals, we deny it not. If you mean that the Nation muſt be one Church as united in one Sacerdotal Head, perſonal or collective, Monarchical or Ariſtocratical, we muſt have further ſatisfaction about this: Firſt, whether it be of Divine or of Humane Inſtitution? Secondly, whether (if humane) its Power be from the Prince, or from the *Conſent* of the particular Churches? Thirdly, what it is empowered to do? 1. Not to make neceſſary Laws for the *Churches* of the ſame ſort with Chriſt's already made. 2. Not to croſs any of his Laws. 3. Not to deſtroy any Privilege of the particular Churches inſtituted by Chriſt. 4. But if it be only to determine of ſuch Circumſtances as the Chriſtian Prince may determine of, we ſhall obey them as his Officers.

And now to your [*Why not?*] I anſwer. Man is not God. God made the Form of the *Univerſal Church*, of which the particular are parts; whoſe Form alſo is of his making: And if God hath made *National Regent Churches* as diſtinct from *Chriſtian Kingdoms* and *Commonwealths*, we will obey them; if not, we muſt know what Men made them, and by what authority, and whether God authorized them thereto; if not, your [*Why not*] is anſwered.

§. 26. Serm. p. 18. ‘[*Nay, if it be mutual Conſent and Agreement which ‘makes a Church, then why may not National Societies agreeing together in the ſame ‘Faith, and under the ſame Government and Diſcipline, be as truly and properly a ‘Church as any particular Congregation?*

Anſ. 1. Is it only *de nomine*, or *de re* that you ask? If *de nomine*, we grant you, that a Parliament, an Army may be truly called *Eccleſia*; if *de re*, we grant you that it is truly a Church of another kind. 2. Mutual Conſent makes a Church, but *God's Conſent* or *Inſtitution* muſt go firſt to warrant that Conſent, and make it a Church which he will own: Elſe mutual Conſent may make it but *Jeroboam's* Church, or a falſe and ſinful Policy. Prove if you can, that God hath authorized Men to make as many new Church-Species, Policies or Forms as they pleaſe; or any againſt, or above, or equal to thoſe of his Inſtitution, beſides *Magiſtracy*,

§. 27.

§ 27. Serm. p. 19. *Why many of these Cities, united under one Civil Government, and the same Rules* of *Religion, should not be called one National Church, I cannot understand: which makes me wonder at those who say they cannot tell what we mean by the Church of England*: Sacrileg. Desert. p. 35.

Answ. 1. *Admiratio est ignorantis*: I am as ignorant of you, as you are of me; therefore may answer wondering with wondering; 1. That such a Man should not know the reason when I so plainly and distinctly wrote it down. 2. And that while you wonder, you should not vouchsafe to give me the least means of Satisfaction. For I suppose few will think that you do so much as attempt it here. 3. You make it still as if the Controversie were *de nomine*, what it *may be called*; when I only spake *de re*, and bid you call it *what you will*, if you will but tell us your meaning. 4. Yea in my Plea, sect. 4, 5. and in the Addition: I fully shewed what we grant *de re, & de nomine*, and what we deny; and what the state of our Controversie is: and do you think to satisfie us, after all this with *Wondering* that we understand not what you mean?

§ 28. Serm. [*In short, we mean, that Society of Christian People, which in this 'Nation are united under the same Profession of Faith, the same Laws of Govern-'ment*, and *Rules of Divine Worship*.]

Answ. And will not they, that know not your Heart any otherwise than by such Words, deride us, if we should pretend by these Words, to be ever the nearer understanding your Resolution of the Controversie?

1. The essential constitutive Parts of a political Society are the *Pars regens & pars subdita* (as is aforesaid.) And here is no mention of the *Regent part* at all; can any Man tell by this whether it be the *King*, or a *Clergy Head*, that you take to be the Constitutive Head?

2. *Laws* and *Rules*, are part of the *Administration*, and our question is of the *Constitution*. Is this then any satisfying Definition?

3. The Papists by this Definition are the national Church [*They are* a *Society* of *Christian People, which in this Nation are united under the same Profession of Faith, the same Laws of Government*, and *Rules* of *Divine Worship*] viz. *Papal*. If you say, *They are not all the Nation*. I answer, 1. nor doth your Definition require it. 2. *You* are not all.

If you say that they are not the major part. I answer, 1. Whether *you are* I know not. 2. In *Ireland* they are, and so are *there* the National Church by your Definition.

If you say that you mean the Laws of *Lawful* Governours. I answer, 1. The Papists take the Pope for their lawful Governour: 2. If a Usurper get Possession (as K. *Stephen* and many others,) is the National Church then dead or null? 3. There is no mention of *lawful* in your Definitions.

4. But though you will not tell us whether you mean *Divine* or *Humane Laws*

Laws and *Rules*, yet I may confidently conjecture that it is *Humane* you mean: for elſe, 1. I am of the ſame National Church that you are; yea if I prove that I am more conformable to God's Laws than you, and ſuch as you, I ſhall prove that it will be a harder queſtion whether you are of the Church of *Eng.* than whether I am. 2. And you might know that ſuch a Church we no more deny than you do (at leaſt) 3. But then it can be but *ſincere* (not perfect) Obedience to God's Laws and Rules, which muſt prove one to be of this Church; or elſe no Man is of it. And then you muſt ſhew us whether a miſtake in as ſmall a matter as Meat and Drink, or a Ceremony, or Liturgick Form, or Dioceſan order, do cut one off from that Church. If yea, than how much more would ſuch Conformity to ſin do it? which we fear.

But ſuppoſing that you mean *Humane Laws.* 5. Why may not *Divine* Laws make a Church? If humane Laws were neceſſary *ad bene eſſe*, the Chriſtians that I have read and converſt with, think that they are not neceſſary to the *Being* of a Church *in ſenſu famoſiore*; why then ſhould they be in the Definition, and only they?

6. But the difficulty recurreth as to *Humane Laws*, which of them are neceſſary to the *Being* of the Church: For your Definition diſtinguiſheth not: The King hath great and excellent Laws which we all conform to: Doth not our Conformity to theſe ſeem to prove us of the National Church, though we conform not to your Formalities and Oaths and Ceremonies? Imperfect Obedience ſerveth to continue men Subjects to the King: It is not every Drunkeneſs, or Oath, or Fornication, much leſs the miſs of a Complement or Ceremony, that makes a Man a Rebel or an Outlaw: Why then ſhould the refuſal of a Prelates Subſcription or Formality unchurch a ſound and honeſt Chriſtian?

7. And if the humane Laws and Rules which you mention (what ever you mean by them) be ſubordinate to God's Laws, and ſo be honeſt, good and obligatory, why ſhould they cut off thoſe from the Church which Chriſt's *Laws* cut not off; yea, which Chriſt receiveth and commandeth us to receive? *Receive him, for God receiveth him*: and, *receive him as Chriſt receiveth us*, (notwithſtanding our Infirmities) were good reaſonings in St. *Paul's* Judgment, which I prefer before any Biſhops that I know.

8. And a Man of leſs Acquaintance or Wit than you, cannot be ignorant, what abundance of Differences there are among your ſelves. I have named you no ſmall number in my 2d. Plea: ſome of you are hot againſt that which is called *Arminianiſm*, and ſome hot for it: ſome are for Biſhops and Presbyters being of one Order, and ſome of divers: all are not of the mind of the Biſhop of *Hereford* that wrote *Naked Truth*: ſome (even Biſhops) think that the damnatory part of *Athanaſius's* Creed is not approved by Conformity: others, think that it is all to be approved: A multitude ſuch

difference

differences there are among your selves: And why should not this as much unchurch some of you, if it be [*being under the same Laws*] that maketh you one Church, as the forbearing of a Declaration of Assent and Consent, or of a Surplice, &c.

9. Especially tell us, whether the Conformist's difference about the *Constitutive Regent Part* of the Church of *England*, some being for *one species*, and some for *another*, do not plainly make them to be of *two distinct Churches* of *England*, and further different from each other than we are from any part. We justly say the Papists, who are for *two species* of Soveraigns, some for the *Pope*, and some for a general Council, are plainly of two Churches: for the regent part is essential. And I am sure that one part of the most Eminent Disputers for the Church of *England* and Conformity, say that the King is the *Extraneous* Civil Governour, but the Bishops are the *Constitutive Essential Internal Governours* of the Church as a Church; and that if the Bishops command the use of one Translation, Version, Metre, Liturgie, and the King another, we are to obey the Bishops, and not the King: And that the efficient cause of a National Church, is the Bishops Agreement among themselves to associate into such a Church. And others say, that it is the King and his Laws, that are the efficient of such a Church, and are to be obeyed in matter of the Ciricumstances of Worship, *&c.* before the Bishops. Can you prove that this difference between the Conformists, about the very Constitutive Regent Power, is not greater than Mens differences about a Ceremony or Form? and doth not more to make them to be of two Churches?

10. If all this confused stir be but about *a Christian Kingdom*, be it known to you that we take such to be of *Divine Command*: And if you know it not, or dissemble it, after I have said so much of it, in the first Plea, and elsewhere, I cannot help that, *viz.* if you will talk publickly against what you know, or know not when told, because you will not know. But I have there largely told you, what the Power of Princes about Church matters is, which if you will read, I will not repeat.

11. Your Words [*Laws and Rules*] would induce one to think that you joyned the *King's Laws* and the *Bishop's Canons* together in your meaning, as the bond of Unity. If so, is it two sorts of Governours, (by the Sword, and by the Word, Magistrates and Pastors) which you take for the constitutive regent parts of the Church? If so, then either in Coordination and Coalition, or in Subordination. The first cannot be, that the two Species in Coalition should make one Head, unless both were in the King as *Persona Mixta*, both Lay and Clergie, as some affirm him to be like *Melchizedeck*: But this both King and Clergy disown. Nor can the second be, because a subordinate Power is not essential to the whole body politick, but only the supream. And the Magistracy and Ministry are coordinate

Species

Species, both depending immediately on God, and Subordinate Mutually only *Secundum quid:* Nor is the Legiſlative Power in *England* any other than one, which is in the *King* and *Parliament* conjunct. The Biſhops Canons are not Laws *Ejuſdem Speciei*; till the *King* and *Parliament* make them ſuch. If this be your Judgment, there are I think but few *Conformiſts* of your mind.

12. I muſt Conjecture therefore by your words, That the *Laws* and *Rules* which you define the Church by, are the *Laws* of the *King* and *Parliament*; and that it is the Civil Chriſtian Sovereign that you take for the Conſtitutive Head of that National Church which you plead for; or elſe I know not what to Conjecture. And if this be your Meaning, I add to what is ſaid: 1. *Eraſtians* have hitherto been diſtaſted by the *Biſhops*, and I doubt they will by this take you for ſomewhat worſe.

2. What doth your *National Church* differ from a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, which we deny not?

3. Do you think there is no other Species of a *Church*, beſides that which is Conſtituted by the Chriſtian Magiſtrate as Head?

1. All the Chriſtian World, as far as I can learn by Hiſtory (no conſiderable part excepted) have been in all Ages, and to this Day are of another mind. And who then is the great *Nonconformiſt* and *Separatiſt*, You or I; if this be your mind?

2. The Magiſtracy, and Paſtoral Office are of different Species: Therefore the Churches Conſtituted by their Regency are of different Species.

3. *Conſtantines* words have hitherto been commonly received, That He (and ſo Chriſtian *Kings*) was *Biſhop* without the *Church*, and the proper *Biſhop* within: that is, That he was the Governour of the Church, by the Sword, as the *King* is of all Scholars, Phyſitians, Families, *&c.* but not the Governour by the *Word* and *Keys*; as the *King* is not a School-Maſter, Phyſitian, or the formal Specifying Governour of School, Colledge, Family, as ſuch. Biſhop *Bilſon*, of *Subjection*, moſt clearly openeth the difference, and I think Chriſtians commonly agree to it; between the Office of Governing by the *Sword*, and by the *Word*; even about the Church it ſelf.

4. Chriſt ſettled immediately the Paſtoral Office, and did not leave it to Princes to make it: And He ſettled Churches under the Paſtors, when there were no Chriſtian Princes; And when the *Emperours* became Chriſtians, they never took themſelves to be the intrinſick Conſtitutive Rectors of the Churches, but

Accidental Heads, as is aforesaid. And all the Councils, and their Canons fully shew, that the *Bishops* were still of this mind. And our greatest Defenders of the Power of Princes, *Bilson*, *Andrews*, *Buckeridge*, *Spalatensis*, &c. were of the same mind, and ascribe to them no more.

5. Else Heathen, and Infidel Princes might be Essential to the Church in the Gospel-Notion: For they are the Governours of it by the Sword, and may possibly by the Counsel of Christians, make them as good Laws as many Christian Princes do. *Julian* made no great Change of the Church-Laws.

But I Labour in vain, in proving that there is a *Sacerdotal* or *Clergy-Church-Form* or *Species*; for I suppose you cannot deny it; and if you do, few others will. I suppose it is only the *National Form*, which you take to be Constituted by a Lay-Head. But few Christians will deny, That the Sacerdotal or Clergy-Form of a particular Church, is of Divine Institution; and that Men have not power to destroy that Form; or change the Office there, Instituted by the *Holy Ghost*. Though the Forms of *Associated Churches*, *Diocesan*, *Metropolitan*, *Provincial*, *Patriarchal*, are judged by very many, to be of Humane Invention: And what Man may make, Man on good Reason may unmake or alter. But if you Grant us the Divine Form before mentioned; I shall Grant you that a *National Church* is also of Divine Command; if you mean but a Christian Kingdom. But when one Form is Denominated from the *Pastoral Office* related to the Flock, and the other from the *Magistrates Office*: What hath a Man that can understand the State of the Controversy, to do here; but to shew what is the *Pastoral Office* towards the Church, and what is the *Magistrates*? For sure they are not the same. And yet because that it is the *Pastoral Form*, which the word [*Church*] denoteth in the strict and usual Christian Sense; Our Sovereignes in *England*, to avoid the *Papists* Exceptions, have forsaken the Title of [*Head* of the *Church*] lest they should seem to claim a Constitutive Headship of a Church strictly taken, and use only the Term [*Governour*.] Even as *Christ* is said by St. *Paul*, *Eph.* 1. to be *Head over all things*, *To the Church* [*Over* and *To*] much differ.

And I yet see not why on the same Reason that we call a Christian Kingdom, or Republick a *National Church*; we may not also call *London*, *York*, &c. a *City-Church*, as Headed by the *Mayor*, as the Christian Magistrate, and so talk of *Provincial*,

cial, Conſular, and *Proconſular Churches, Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, Democratical Churches*; and make all the Controverſies [which Church-Form is beſt] as Politicks do what Form of a *Common-Wealth* is beſt.

And thus they that chide the *Independents* for making the *People* Governours of their little Congregations (which I think yet moſt of them diſclaim) do this way quite exceed them in Popularity, and in *Democraties* will make the People Governours of all the *Churches*, even National including the particulars. For I ſuppoſe they will not ſay, that *Democratical*, Civil Government is unlawful.

And whereas *Cyprian* ſaith: *Ubi Epiſcopus, ibi Eccleſia*; you will ſay, *Where* the *Mayor* or *Bayliffe* is, there is the *Church*. But I trow the *Biſhop* of *London* believeth that there is another ſort of *London-Church-Form*, beſides my Lord-*Mayors* Relation to them. But what abundance of *Church-Forms*, Supream and Subordinate may diverſity of Magiſtracy make?

§. 29. Sermon p. 19. [*I do not intend to ſpeak of the Terms upon which Perſons are to be admitted among us to the Exerciſe of the function of the Miniſtry*; *but of the Terms of* Lay-Communion, *i. e. thoſe which are neceſſary for Perſons to joyn in our Prayers and Sacraments, and other Offices of Divine Worſhip.*

Anſw. 1. But your work would have been done more effectually if you had begun at the part which you intend not to ſpeak of: I ſuppoſe it is not for want of *Charity*, nor *Concern*, that you intend it not; and therefore, ſuppoſe that ſomebody elſe will do it at laſt. I have heard of ſome above your order, that could better ſpare the *Nonconforming* Miniſters than the People, and ſaid plainly, that they increaſed the Impoſitions, becauſe they could do better without us, than with us: And ſome have ſaid, If this will not caſt them out, more ſhall do it. I take it for granted, that this pretermitted part of your Work, is indeed, the All that you have to do, in the Works of *Accuſing*, and Afflicting the *Nonconformiſts*; and till this be done, the reſt of your Accuſations will confute themſelves; and I doubt not but it will be attempted; and if it be truly, and ſatisfactory, I will give you thanks.

2. Your Term of [*Lay-Communion*] remembreth me, that if (as you ſeem) you *Eſſentiate* your *Church* of *England* by a *Lay-Ruler*, and his Laws, *viz.* the *King*, and the Laws made by him for Religious Government; the People that you accuſe are no Separatiſts, though they Separate from the *Dioceſanes*;

becauſe they hold this *Lay-Communion*; that is, though they are not perfectly Obedient, they are Subjects of the *Lay-Governour*, and ſo Members of the Kingdom, which is the *National-Church*.

3. And as to your *Lay-Communion* here ſpoken of, *So far as it is Lawful*, where you have Preach'd or Written for it once, I think, I have done it many times: I ſhall be far from Contradicting you in that.

§. 30. Sermon p. 20. [*I will not ſay, there hath been a great deal of Art uſed to confound theſe two* (*and it is eaſy to diſcern to what purpoſe it is.*)

Anſw. 1. I have not Art enough well to reconcile your *Negative*, and your *Parentheſis*, which intimateth an Affirmation: If you will not ſay ſuch Art *was uſed*; how can you intimate [*to what purpoſe it's uſed.*] Can you tell ſo eaſily *why* it *was done*, and not tell that indeed it *was done* at all? But perhaps you *can tell*, though you *will not*. I would fain know why: No Man that Reads your Words, can well believe that it is through the redundancy of your kindneſs.

2. Forgive this Truth: Of all Men that have Written againſt *Nonconformity*, I remember few that may, worſe than you ſpeak againſt *CONFOUNDING*; as I ſhall further prove.

30. If I be one of thoſe that you ſpeak of, *Confounding* is not the greateſt fault of your words; while it is viſible that in my firſt *Plea* I diſtinctly enumerated the Caſe of the Nonconformity of the Laity and the Clergy. And I ſpake by conſent for many of my acquaintance. And I am likeſt to be meant by you, becauſe divers others, that go farther from you, take Lay-conformity to be unlawful, and largely give their reaſons for it. How then did you expect to be believed when our Books are in ſo many hands?

4. None are fitter Judges of Arts, than the moſt exerciſed Artificers: If you are skill'd and exerciſed in ſuch *Arts* your ſelf, you may the eaſiler diſcerne both the Art and purpoſe. And yet we are ſo neer our ſelves that I cannot eaſily believe that you know my Arts or purpoſes ſo well as I do my ſelf.

§ 31. Serm. [*'I dare ſay the People's not underſtanding the 'difference of theſe two Caſes, hath been a great occaſion of the preſent 'ſeparation.*

Anſ. No doubt but there is a great difference between the Miniſters Caſe of Conformity, and the Peoples, which makes ſome of them think much worſe of a Conforming Miniſter, than of a Conforming Lay-man: which ſheweth that the difference is not wholly

wholly unknown to them. But I think I have done more to acquaint them with the difference, than you or any of your tribe have done.

§ 32. Serm. [' *For in the Judgment of the moſt impartial men* ' *of the Diſſenters at this day, though they think the Caſe of the Mini-* ' *ſters very hard on the account of Subſcriptions and Declarations* ' *required of them, yet they confeſs, very little is to be ſaid on the* ' *behalf of the People, from whom none of thoſe things are required.*

Anſ. 1. This is but ſuch Confuſion as conſtituteth this Sermon. We think that nothing of truth can be ſaid for any of the People's errors; no more than for the [*very hard*] and ſinful caſe of our ſelves if we ſhould Conform: If any go one ſtep too far from you, they are unjuſtifiable therein: But we have ſhewed thoſe that will ſee, that much may be ſaid on the People's behalf for much of their Nonconformity, and alſo for ſuch aſſembling as you call ſeparation.

2. And ſurely if you had the due ſenſe of your *Brethrens Caſe*, of your *Own Caſe*, and of the *Kingdoms Caſe*, you would perceive how neceſſary the forbearing of the impoſition of thoſe *very hard* things is to the healing of that which doth offend you; and to greater ends than that.

§ 33. Serm. [*So that the People are condemned in their ſeparation by their own teachers; But how they can preach lawfully to a People who commit a fault in hearing them, I do not underſtand.*

Anſ. 1. The People that are guilty of any ſinful ſeparation are reproved by us; but not thoſe that ſeparate no further than is their duty. In my firſt *Plea* I deſcribed no leſs than 30 Caſes in which ſeparation is a ſin; and neer 40 Inſtances in which ſome ſeparation is a duty or no ſin: And of all this you here take no notice, and toſs the bare confounding name of *Separation*, as if the Sound ought to affright men from all that you are againſt; ſure you could never think that we had Brains or Conſciences, if ſuch dealing ſhould paſs for ſatisfactory with us: Can any man tell by this bare *Name*, or any thing in your Book, what that Separation is which you condemn. The word *Hereſie* with a Papiſt, and the word [*Separation*] and [*Schiſm*] with ſome Conformiſts, ſeem to be terms of Art: But what Art is it? Sure it is not the Carteſian nor the Epicurean Philoſophy, which layeth ſo much on *Atomes and Motion*: I cannot Imagine what Contexture of Atomes ſhould cauſe the Sound of the word [*Separation*] or [*Schiſm*] to make ſuch a motion as ſhould drive men out of their Religion and Wits. I am not ſo happy as to be an Academical Graduate; but I have long ago read *Lullius* and many of his Com-

Commentators; and I find no Philosophy more likely, to lay much on the Power of words; except that which we call Magick or Charming. For my part, I was born with a disease (if it be such) that hateth Confusion and Deceit, and inclineth me to bring things into light, and to discern between things that differ. And if you Doctors have learned the Art of Reduceing a *Syllogism* into a *Simple terme* or *Name*, it is quite above my kind of Learning: I suppose it is such a Logical contracted Syllogism that you intend: But as *short writing* called *Characters*, though expeditious, is hard to be read by others; so your contracted Syllogism, in the name [*Separation*] and [*Schism*] will be more useful to you and yours, than to strangers that never saw your heart. If *Usefulness* and *Usedness*, even by some of the Reverend, may afford us a Prognostick, I may conjecture that even Lying (and other necessary arts) are ascending in hope to be placed among the Cardinal virtues, and those that scruple it, may be numbered with Schismaticks, Separatists and Rogues.

§ 34. If I would here again tell you what Separation I take to be lawful, and what unlawful, and desire you to define that which you accuse me of, I may expect that in your Reply you will dissemble it; But I will trie you with a few instances of one sort, and desire you to tell me which it is that you mean.

I. Do you think that he is a *Separatist* that meeteth not in the same Parish-Church with you? No sure: For then you are one to others, and other Parishes such to you.

II. Is he a Separatist that liveth in your Parish, and ordinarily meeteth not in your Temple, but another allowed place? If so, the Bishop of *Eli* is a Separatist in your Parish, that keepeth a Meeting in his Chappel when you preach. If not so, when we had the Kings License at least, the *place* made Us not Separatists.

III. Is every one a Separatist that differeth from you in Doctrine, in publick Preaching? If so, are you not Separatists one from another, when one Preacheth for that wich is called, Absolute Election, Reprobation, Universal Redemption, Free-will, Falling from justification, the morality of the Sabbath, *&c.* and others against these? If not; Is not difference in such Doctrines as great a difference, as using and not useing some of your Liturgick Forms and Ceremonies?

IV. Are all different modes of Worship enough to make our Party *Separatists*? Then the French and Dutch Churches are Separatists, and either the Cathedrals or the Parish-Churches, as to their Vestments, Organs, Chore, mode of Singing, *&c.* And the allowed private Baptismes and Communion with the sick, are Separations.

V. Doth

V. Doth every disobedience to the King, and Laws, and Canons in matters of Religion, Government and Worship, make men Separatists? If so, then when ever a Conformist disobediently shorteneth his Common-Prayer, or leaveth off his Surplice, or giveth the Sacrament to one that kneeleth not, or receiveth one of another Parish to Communion, &c. he is a Separatist. Yea no man then is not a Separatist sometimes.

VI. If the Diocesane be the lowest political Church, and a Parish but a part of a Church, as they hold that take a Bishop to be a Constitutive part; how is he said to separate from the Church that owneth his Diocesane and the Diocess, what ever place in that Diocess he meet in, seeing he separateth not from the Kingdom that stayeth in it and owneth the King, though in some acts he disobey? Nor doth every Boy that is faulty separate from the School.

VII. Is he a greater Separatist that confesseth you to be a true Church, and your communion lawful, but preferreth another as fitter for him; or he that denieth Communion with true worshiping assemblies as unlawful to be Communicated with, when it is not so. If the former, then Condemning you as no Church is a diminution or no aggravation of separation, and the Local presence of an Infidel or a Scorner would be a less separate state, than the absence of your friends. If the latter (which is certain) then if I can prove the Assemblies lawful which you condemne, you are the true Separatists that condemn them, and deny Communion with them, and declare such Communion to be unlawful. I Communicate with your Assemblies, and you utterly shun, refuse and condemn Communion with ours; which then is the Separatist, if I prove ours to be as good as yours?

VIII. Many English Doctors say, *Rome* is a true Church, as a Knave or Thief is a true man, and we separated not from It, but they cast Us out for doing our duty, and not sinning as they do. I say not as they (for as the Pope claimeth the Headship of the Church Universally, that form of Policy is not of God, and we separate from that essencial form of their pretended Church:) But *ad hominem* if the Diocesane also be a true Church, and we cast out of it for not sinning, are We separatists, or are our Ejectors such?

IX. I have shewed you that the *Canon* Excommunicate *ipso facto* all that say the imposed Conformity is unlawful. If this be unjust, is it *Separation* to be so Excommuincated? and who is the Schismatick here? And what shall be thought of such Church-men as will first *ipso facto* Excommunicate us for our duty, and then as

you

you do, call us Separatists. Would you have Excommunicate Men, Communicate with you? I (and many) do so, because you shall be the Executioners of your own sentence, and not I: But with what face can men cast Men out by Canon *ipso facto*, and then revile them for not coming in. You can mean no other in common sense, but that we are Schismaticks or separatists because we are not of the Conformist's judgment: And that is not in our power: And you differ more in judgment in greater matters from each other; and yet call it not Schisme or Separation. Yea you differ about the very essential form of your National Church, one part taking it to be the Kings supemacy, and another to be the Bishops or Clergy's Power: And therefore you cannot be truly of one National Church, that are not for one essential Form.

X. If men be wrongfuly Excommunicate, are they thereby absolved from all publick Worshipping of God? or do they lose their Right to all Church-Communion? I have else where cited you Canons enow that say the contrary, and that *Clave Errante* the excommunication hurteth none but the Excommunicator: And I have Cited Bishop *Tailor*'s Full Consent. Must we not then Meet and Worship as we can, when you wrongfully Excommunicate us?

XI. Are not the *Laity*, by your Canon, forbidden to Receive the *Sacrament* in another Parish? or, any other to receive them, if they dare not Receive it from a Non-Preaching Minister at Home? And if the People judge, that he that is unable or unwilling to Preach, or that is a *Heretick*, or that liveth in such heinous Sins, or Preacheth Malignantly, as to do more Harm than Good, may not lawfully be owned by them for *Christ*'s Ministers, nor their Souls be Committed to their Pastoral Trust; Must they therefore be without a Pastors Care, or all Publick Worship and Communion, and be Condemned for being Wronged?

XII. Were all those Councils *Separatists*, that Decreed, That none shall hear Mass from a Fornicating Priest? And, Were the Canons called the *Apostles*, and the *Greek*-Church that used them, for Separation, that said, [*Episcopus ignorantiâ aut malo animo oppletus, non est Episcopus, sed falsus Episcopus, non a Deo, sed ab hominibus promotus?*] Was *Guildas* a Separatist that told the *Brittish* Wicked Priests, That they were not *Christ*'s Ministers, but Traitours? and that he was not *Eximius Christianus*, that would call them Priests, or Ministers of *Christ*? Were *Cyprian*, and all the *Carthage-Council*, Separatists, that

wrote

wrote the Epiſtle about *Martial* and *Baſilides*, which I Tranſlated; and told the People, It was their Duty to Separate from *Peccatore Præpoſito*, a Scandalous Prelate? and that the Chief Power was in them, to Chooſe the Worthy, or Refuſe the Unworthy? and that they were guilty of Sin, if they joined with ſuch Sinners? Who made *You* a more Reverend and Credible Judge of Separation, than *Cyprian*, and this *Council?* At leaſt, Who will think, that you may Judge them *Separatiſts*, or guilty of *Schiſm?*

XIII. Are not the *Laity*, by your Canon, to be denied the *Sacrament*, if they be not *willing of your Epiſcopal Confirmation?* And when *Impoſition of Hands* is made the *Signe*, by which *Confirming* or *Aſſuring Grace* is conveyed, and ſome Biſhops aſſigne no leſs to it; they fear, leſt it be made a *Sacrament*. Be their Doubts juſt or not, they cannot overcome them. And, Muſt they therefore Live without *Sacramental* Communion? By what Law?

XIV. Are not the *Laity*, that dare not Receive the *Sacrament* Kneeling, for the Reaſons elſe-where mentioned, to be denied the *Sacrament* by your Rule? And though herein they fear Sin more than they have cauſe, Muſt they that cannot Change their own Judgments, live all their Dayes without the *Sacrament?* When as *General Councils* Decreed, That none ſhould adore Kneeling on any Lord's Day, and the *Church* for a *Thouſand* Years, practiſed accordingly; Are all *Separatiſts*, that dare not do that in ſuch an Inſtance, which they judge to be flat Sin; nor yet dare caſt off *Sacramental Communion?*

XV. When the *Laity* cannot have their Children Baptized, without ſuch Uſe of the Tranſient Dedicating Image of the Croſs, and ſuch Uſe of Entitling and Covenanting *God-Fathers*; which, on the Reaſons largely given by me, they take to be no ſmall Sin; Is it Separation to join with Paſtors, that will otherwiſe Baptize them? Are they bound to ſin againſt their Conſciences, or to leave their Children Unbaptized? or, Prefer ſuch Paſtors as Refuſe them?

XVI. Is it Separation for Men to refuſe Paſtors that are Uſurpers, and have no true Power over them? Sure it is not to Refuſe an Uſurper of the Kingly Power; and, Why then of the Church-Power? Which of the Biſhops thought it any Sin, in the Dayes of Uſurpation, to forſake their Pariſh-Churches? And in my *Abridgment of Church-Hiſtory*, I have cited many Canons, which prove it the Common Judgment of the Church for *One Thouſand* Years, or near; That he was no Biſhop,

that was not Choſen by the Clergy, and the People; or came in without the Peoples Conſent. And if you will Read a late Treatiſe of Father *Paul Servita* of *Venice*, (a very Venerable Author) you will ſee this at large Confirmed. And, if this be true, Is it Schiſm to take ſuch for none of our Paſtors? And Patrons chooſe Paſtors for the Peoples Souls, who too often care not for their own: Yea, though they believe not that Man hath an Immortal Soul, their Power of Electing thoſe that Men muſt take for the Guides of their Souls, is never-the leſs for their Infidelity. What Law of *God* bindeth all Men to ſtand to their Choice? How many Hundred Congregations have Incumbents, whom the People never Conſented to; but take them for their Hinderers and Burden.

XVII. *Diſpoſitio materiæ neceſſaria eſt ad Receptionem formæ: non ex quovis ligno fit Mercurius.* If a Perſon be uncapable of the Miniſterial Office, it is no Sin to Judge him no Miniſter. Thoſe are Uncapable, 1. Who have not tolerable Miniſterial Knowledge and Utterance. 2. Who are *Hereticks*. 3. Who malignantly Oppoſe ſerious Religion as Hypocriſie, or a needleſs Thing. 4. Who, by their wicked Lives, do more Hurt than they do Good. From ſuch, St. *Paul* bids Men *Turn away*; that have a Form of Godlineſs, but deny the Power. Is it *Schiſm*, to Obey ſuch Commands? And how great a Number of ſuch Caſes there are, I need not tell the People.

XVIII. I am loth to diſpleaſe you; and I write not to Accuſe *You*, or other *Conformiſts*. But as *Paul* was conſtreined by Accuſers, to ſpeak ſharply of them, and like a Fool (though not fooliſhly) of himſelf: So you conſtrein us to ſay that in our own Defence, which will Exaſperate you; and, I doubt, you cannot eaſily bear. And *God* ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not Hate thy Brother in thy Heart: Thou ſhalt in any wiſe Rebuke thy Neighbour, and not ſuffer Sin upon him.* I have told you only, how many and heinous the Sins are, which we fear we ſhould be Guilty of ſhould we Conform. The *Thirty* Aggravations, named *Sect.* 16. are Tremendous. We have yet heard from none of you, any thing which ſhould excuſe us from ſuch Guilt, if we did Conform. And if the People think, (though they ſhould miſtake) that all the *Conformiſts* are Guilty of the like, Can you wonder, that they Prefer leſs Guilty Paſtors, to truſt the Conduct of their Souls with; when *Heb.* 13. they are commanded to be Followers of their Guides? If they miſtake, [1 *Cor.* 5. *With ſuch not to Eat*,] and, [*From ſuch turn away*] Is it Intolerable?

But

But bear with needful Truth, as to your ſelf. You here would diſſwade the *Nonconformiſts* from their Publick Miniſtry, and plead it to be their Sin: By this you own the Silencing and Alienation of about *Two Thouſand* ſuch Miniſters, till they Conform. I ask't you formerly, is it not Sacrilege, to Alienate (unjuſtly) Devoted, Conſecrated Perſons, and worſe than to Alienate Lands or Monies? And, Is it not a *Hindering of God's Word?* for which the *Liturgy* diſſwadeth Men from the *Sacrament*, leſt the *Devil enter into them.* I only ſay, *If Men be Guilty of this*, (which *You* think, the *Nonconformiſts* are, by not Conforming; and *They* think, *Others* are.) If you had Robbed *Thouſand* Churches of the Communion-Plate, or the Glebe-Land, or Conſented to the Doing of it: Were it Separation and Schiſm for your Pariſh to prefer another Paſtor of their own Choice? And when you publiſh your Conſent to the Alienating or Silencing about *Two Thouſand* ſuch Miniſters, if Men think that you do much worſe than a *Thouſand* Church-Robbers, though they ſhould miſtake, Is not their Truſting another Paſtor with the Conduct of their Souls, a tolerable Thing? Dear *Brother*, Try to take off the Byaſs of your Judgment, and bear with neceſſary Truth, though rough. Though your *Logical Faculty* run lamentably Low in this your Accuſing *Sermon*, I impute it to the Badneſs of your *Cauſe*. Undoubtedly, you have Learning enough, to know that you muſt Die; and, That after *Death*, *Judgment* muſt be expected; and that the Time is ſhort; and the Faſhion of theſe deceiving Worldly Things, doth paſs away. And, Can you think, that your Approbation and Endeavours to Silence ſo many ſuch Miniſters while your own Experience mighttell you, That *even You* do need much Help in ſuch a Charge as you undertake, will be the Matter of a Comfortable Account? If you think ſo, I muſt ſay, That a little ſober, impartial, believing Conſideration, will make a Man Wiſer, than the Reading of many Books with an unhumbled, biaſſed Mind. The Day is coming, when you will ſee, that you were in a better, ſafer way, when with peaceable Dr. *Tillotſon*, you ſeemed to Conſent to the Plat-form of an Act for our Concord and Reſtoration; which made me tell many Parliament-Men, [*Refer our Cauſe to the Counſel of Dr.* Tillotſon, *and Dr.* Stillingfleet, *and we ſhall preſently be Healed.*] But, What is Man? And, What need have we to pray, *Lead us not into Temptation?*

XIX. If Men know the need of the full Uſe of the Paſtoral-Office for their Souls, and cannot ſpare it, and yet live

where they cannot Enjoy one Half or Quarter of it; Is it Schism for them to seek to Enjoy the rest? Dr. *Hammond*, in his *Annotations*, oft tells us, *That the Office of a Bishop, was, To Preach, To Direct Mens Consciences, To Visit and Pray with the Sick, To take Care of all the Poor, and the Moneys gathered for them, To be their Guide in Publick Worship, To Exercise* Christ's *Discipline, Admonishing, Rejecting the Obstinate, Restoring the Penitent, Strengthening the Weak, Comforting the Afflicted, Resolving the Doubtful, Convincing Gain-sayers*, &c. Some of your most Peaceable Conformable Hearers tell me, [*We have need of a Frequent Help, by the Company and Councel of a Pastor.*] But we never see him, but in the Pulpit. And if we should all go to seek him in another Parish where he dwells, when ever we need a Pastor's Councel, were he at Leisure and willing, he could noe have time to speak to one of an Hundred, that might (at once) wait to speak with him: So that, we have none of this necessary Pastoral Help, when we greatly need it. Yea, not the Sixth, or Tenth Part of the Parish can come to Hear him in the Church. And when We that most desire it get in, it troubleth us to think, that we thereby keep out those that least desire it, but most need it; who, knowing the Difficulty of getting Room, do stay at Home, and never seek it: So that, *Five* Parts of *Six* of our Neighbours, use not to go to any Church at all, no more than Infidels. And if in pity we perswade them to go to any *Nonconformist's* Meeting, they say the Clergy will Damn them as *Schismaticks*. The Question now is, Whether *Ten Thousand, or Twenty Thousand* in a Parish, are bound to live without all Private Pastoral Help and Councel; yea, and to forbear all Publick Worshipping of *God*, and Hearing of his *Word*? And, if they seek Relief of *Nonconforming* Ministers, Publickly and Privately, Whether it be Sinful Separation? If Men can spare the Ministry, Why are they Maintained? If they are needful for the Safety of Mens Souls, Must so many *Thousands* hazard their Souls for want of needful Help, lest they be called *Separatists*? If the Dean of St. *Pauls* be called the *Parson of the Parish*, and Preach to others that can Hear him, Will that serve the Needs of all the rest?

XX. In *Moscovie*, where a Christian Prince, and the Laws forbid all Preaching, and Publick Worship, save the Reading of *Homilies* and *Liturgies*; Is it Separation, and Sinful Schism, to Disobey this, and otherwise to Preach and Worship *God*?

XXI. Is it Schism in *France*, and such other Countries, for the

the *Proteſtants* to Meet to Preach and Worſhip *God*, againſt the Wills of the *King* and *Biſhops?* It's true, that great Sin is neceſſarily thus avoided by *them*, which are not Impoſed upon *us*. But if it prove, that *any Sin* is made neceſſary to Communion; the Degree will not much vary the Caſe, as to the Point of Separation.

XXII. In divers Countries, the *Prince* is of one Religion, or Mode of Religion, and the *Biſhops* of another: The Queſtion is, Who are the Schiſmaticks, the People that in their Aſſemblies, and Mode of Worſhip, do follow the *Prince*, or they that follow the *Biſhops?* Some great Writers for Conformity tell me, That if the *King* Command one *Liturgy*, *Tranſlation*, *Verſion*, *Ceremony*, &c. and the *Biſhop* another, I muſt obey the *Biſhop* before the *King*: Others ſay, I muſt Obey the *King* before the *Biſhop*, (of which before.) Biſhop *Goodman* of *Gloceſter* (a *Papiſt*) complaineth of the *King*, that would not conſent that Clergy-Men ſhould be Chancellours: And I ſpeak with no Biſhop, that diſowneth not Lay-Chancellours Uſe of the Keys. The *Helvetian* Magiſtrates are *Eraſtians*, againſt the Clergies Power of Excommunication: Many of the Paſtors are of the Contrary Judgment. The Duke of *Brandenburgh* is a *Calviniſt*: His Biſhops and Clergy are *Lutherans*. Which Party are the *Schiſmatick?*

XXIII. Were all thoſe Separating *Schiſmaticks*, who, from the Apoſtles Dayes, did Meet, Preach, and Worſhip *God* againſt the Will and Laws of *Princes*; ſometimes of *Heathen Princes*; and ſometimes of *Chriſtians*; (*Conſtantine*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius* the Second, *Anaſtaſius*, *Zeno*, *Juſtinian*, &c.) If ſo, moſt Chriſtian *Biſhops* have been ſuch *Separatiſts*. I have in my *Firſt Plea*, and my *Church-Hiſtory*, given Inſtances enough.

XXIV. Is it *Schiſm*, or Sinful *Separation*, to Diſobey a Command about Religion, which no Man hath true Authority to Give? *Authority* is the *Objectum Formale* of *Obedience*; and where there is no *Authority*, there is no *Diſobedience*, in a formal Senſe, or privative. Moſt *Politicks* ſay, That *Princes* have no Authority againſt the Common Good: All Power of *Princes* and *Paſtors* is of *God*, and is for Edification, and not for Deſtruction. *God* giveth no Power againſt Himſelf, or his Laws, nor the Souls of Men. If the *King* ſhould Command me to Marry a Wife, whom I know to be intolerably unmeet for me; or to Feed my ſelf, and Family with Food, which I find to be againſt our Health; or to uſe a Phyſician, whoſe Ignorance or Negligence, or Untruſtineſs, would endanger my Life: I am

not

not bound to Obey him, both becauſe it is a Matter that is *without* the Verge of his Governing Authority, and becauſe it is againſt the End of Government. *Regal Power* deſtroyeth not *Family-Power*, nor *Perſonal Intereſt* and *Self-Government*; No Man hath Power to Deſtroy or Endanger the Souls of Men, nor forbid them ſeeking their own Edification and Salvation. I Repeat Biſhop *Bilſon*'s Words, *p.* 236. of Subjection: [*Princes have no Right to Call or Confirm Preachers; but to Receive ſuch as be Sent of* God, *and give them Liberty for their Preaching, and Security for their Perſons. And if* Princes *Refuſe ſo to do,* God's *Labourers muſt go forward with that which is Commanded them from Heaven: Not by Diſturbing* Princes *from their Thrones, nor Invading their Realms, as your Father doth, and defendeth he may do; but by mildly Submitting themſelves to the Powers on Earth, and meekly Suffering for the Defence of the Truth, what they ſhall Inflict.* —— Pag. 399. *The Election of Biſhops in thoſe Dayes, belonged to the People, and not to the* Prince: *And though by plain Force, he placed* Lucius *there; yet might the People lawfully Reject him as no Biſhop, and cleave to* Peter, *their Right Paſtor.*] On this, I further ask,

XXV. If the Nonconforming People can prove, That (notwithſtanding the times of Civil Uſurpation, and *Biſhops* Removal) their *Paſtors* had a Lawful Call and title to their Office over them, and they were truly obliged to them, as in that juſt Relation, Whether the Magiſtrates or Biſhops Acts, have made thoſe Relations, and Obligations Null? That the Temples and Tythes are in the Magiſtrates Power, we doubt not: But more than Biſhop *Bilſon*, even many Councils deny it of the *Office*, and *Paſtoral Relation*. Yea, the Univerſal Church was of the ſame mind, And if ſo, how prove you, *e. g.* that the Relation of the Ejected *London* Miniſters, and their Flocks was Diſſolved, and that the Succeders were true Paſtors to the Non-conſenting Flocks?

XXVI. That there are (Alas) Multitudes of Young, Raw, Injudicious, beſides Scandalous *Prieſts*, no Man can deny that knoweth *England*, and hath any Modeſty. If then honeſt People, that are not willing to be Damned, ſhall ſay: [*We beſt know what is ſuitable to our Needs, and what Teachers profit us, and what not. And we find that ſome are ſo Ignorant, that they are unmeet as Plowmen, to reſolve the moſt concerning Caſes of Conſcience; and their Converſation ſavoureth not of any ſerious belief of Chriſtianity, and the World to come, and they do*

but

but Read a few dry words, like School-Boyes saying a Weak Oration, without Life or Seriousness, and we can but little profit by them.] How prove you that it is unlawful for such to use more suitable helps, though Men forbid it? A Soul is precious: *God* Worketh by Means, and according to the suitableness of Means: That agreeth not to some, which others can make shift with: Two or Three words from a *Conformist*, that saith: [*God can Bless the weakest Means to you*; or *the Fault is in your self*] will not serve instead of needful Helps. The *King* or *Bishop* have not Authority to Tie a Sick Man to Eat that which he cannot Digest, or Hurteth him. Every Man is neerliest concerned for his own Soul, and most Entrusted with it. Parish-Order it self, is but a humane alterable Circumstance, which I am not bound to observe at the hazard of my Edification and Salvation.

XXVII. What if the Magistrate grant a Toleration of divers Modes of Worship, as the *French*, and *Dutch* Churches are here Tolerated, and many in *Holland*, and in many other Countries? Are these separating *Schismaticks*, that differ from each other? If so, it is not because they disobey the Magistrate; for he Tolerateth them all: If not, then meer diversity of Modes of Worship maketh not *Schismaticks*.

XXVIII. If it be no true Political Church (in the strict sense as an Organized Society, which hath not true Authorized Pastors, and if any Parish have either *Uncapable Persons*, or such as were never Consented to by the Flocks, and so have no *True Pastor*; and if the Bishops hold, That Parishes are not Proper Political Churches, but parts of Churches, having no Pastors that have the Power of the Keyes, or the whole Essence of the Pastoral Office; but only Half-Pastors, that want an Essential Part of the Power. If on any such Account, any Parishes are no true Pastoral Churches: *Qu.* Whether to Separate from such a Parish, be to Separate from a Church in the sense in question?

XXIX. The mutual Condemnations in the times of the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, *Phantasiasts*, *Image-Patrons*, &c. tell the World how needful, mutual forbearance is, to prevent worse Divisions and Confusions: And the *Papists* take themselves to be all of one Church, though they differ even in Doctrines of Morality, as dangerously as the *Jansenists*, against the *Jesuits* have shewed; and though many Sects and Orders be permitted to Live, and Worship *God* with very great diversity in their several sorts of Monasteries:

Why

Why then should the little differences of our questioned Assemblies, be thought to be so great as maket us not to be of one Church.

XXX. Some good Christians think, That though an undisciplined Church may be Communicated with, occasionally, yea, and constantly, while there is a hopeful Tryal of its Reformation; yet when there is no hope after Patient Tryal, a better Course and Communion should be chosen, where it may be had: And they think, that Multitudes whom they know to be prophane *Swearers, Cursers, Drunkards, Fornicators, Haters* of serious *Piety, Hobbists, Infidels, Atheists, Sadduces*, &c. are continued in the Church of *England*: And they say, they scarce ever heard one Man of all these Excommunicated; nor one Man of them all ever brought to Publick Confession and Repentance. And they think, Lay-Chancellours, having not rightfully the Power of the Keys, there is no ordinary Means of hopeful Reformation, and Exercise of Discipline; especially, the Largeness of the Dioceses making it impossible to be used to One of an Hundred, that (according to the Law of *Christ*) it should be used on. And they think, That the Church-Discipline is not only *None*, as to the Right Use, and made Impossible; but worse than *None*, while it is used most to Excommunicate from *Christ*'s Church, the True and Conscionable Members of *Christ*, that dare not Conform; and so to lead to their Imprisonment, and utter Ruin. And they think, that no Man hath true Authority, to confine them to such an Undisciplined, and Illdisciplined Church; and forbid them the Use of better, where *Christ*'s Discipline may be used. Whether these Men be in the Right, or in the VVrong, if the Matter of Fact be true, I shou'd desire rather the Reformation of such a Church, than the Reproach or Afflicting of Men, as *Separatists* and *Schismaticks*, that choose another sort of Communion, as to their more Ordinary Practice; not denying this to be a true Diseased Church.

And so much in these *Thirty* Instances, about that which I think deserveth not the Reproach of any dangerous Separation. I told you *Thirty* Instances also of Unlawful Separation, which I named. And now you may judge, whether you spake to Edification, when you said, that the [*People are Condemned by their own Teachers*;] without telling, whom, and for what; and how far they Condemn them, and how far not.

§. 34. And, Did you think the Consequence good, That because we think it *Lawful to Hear you*, yea, and to many a *Duty*;

ty; therefore we Condemn them, for *Hearing any one else*, that Conformeth not? As if they that have Communion with your Dioceſan-Church, muſt have Communion with no other? So far am I from your Opinion, that I take it to be wofully Separating and Schiſmatical: And will never be a Member of a Particular Church, which will forbid me Communion with all others that differ from them; yea, that doth not hold its Communion in Unity with all the True Chriſtian Churches on Earth. Though a Schiſmatical Diſputer for Prelacy, tells me, *That though I Communicate with the Church of* England, *I am a Schiſmatick for Communicating with* Nonconformiſts, *who* (ſaith he) *are Schiſmaticks*. But he that will Communicate with no Church that hath any Guilt of Schiſm, when the Chriſtian World is broken into ſo many Sects, I doubt, will be the greateſt Schiſmatick; and will Communicate with few on Earth. And as *Smith* Baptized himſelf, not liking any other Baptiſm, this Man may become a Church to himſelf.

And indeed, the word [*Condemn them*] ſounds Harſh; when it ſignifieth no more, than that we *Judge them to be Miſtaken and Culpable*. If I *Condemn* every Man, or every Church, which I judge to be Sinners, I muſt *Condemn* all Mankind. I uſe not ſo harſh a Phraſe of your Self, as to ſay, *I Condemn You*: When yet I Judge your Book to be more Schiſmatical, than the Meetings of moſt that I am acquainted with; which you Accuſe.

§. 35. But yet, your Miſtake is Greater than I have hitherto mentioned. I know not *many* (if *any*) that uſe to Hear Me, who Separate from You: Many of them are *Epiſcopal*, and for your *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*. I think, moſt of them go to the Pariſh-Churches; and *few* (if *any*) that I know, do deny it to be Lawful. How then can you prove it True, that we *Condemn* them? What is it for? Is it becauſe they neither Separate from the *Conformiſts*, or *Nonconformiſts?* This is it, that we Exhort them to. It was an ill Slip, to put our *Condemning them*, for *Commending them*: But a fair Expoſition will make it Lawful.

§. 36. But you ſay [*How they can preach lawfully to a people that commit a fault in hearing them, I do not underſtand.*]

Anſ. Now you come to your buſineſs: But 1. What if you by Calumny call my ordinary hearers Separatiſts, and they are not ſuch? 2. What if we prove it to be their duty to hear both you and us in ſeaſon, if they need it, or lawful at leaſt; and ſo do commend them, and not condemn them? may we then lawfully

Preach to them? What if the fault which we blame some for, be their judging it *unlawful to hear such as you?* Will your Logick prove, that we call it their *fault to hear us*; as if *hearing us*, and not *hearing you*, were words of the same signification?

And is all necessary which is *lawful?* Do we condemn men that do not all that is *lawful* to do? And because you after infer, that *if it be lawful, it is a Duty*; I would you had told us, whether you take this universally, that [*What ever is lawful is a Duty,*] or only in this case for some special reason, and what that is. I suppose it is, because it is commanded: as if every *lawful* thing commanded were a duty: But we think otherwise, unless the Command be an Act which God Authorizeth the Commander to do. All mens Authority is limited by God: and they have none but from him. For instance, it is lawful to eat brown Bread, and drink Water, (or Wine;) But if the King or Bishop forbid me to eat better, when my health requireth it, I am not bound to obey them: It is lawful to were Sackcloth, but none have power to forbid me fitter Cloathing: It is lawful to set a Son Apprentice to a *Chimny sweeper*, or to an *Ale-seller* or *Vintner*; but if the Bishop or any other forbid one to place him better, it obligeth not: It is lawful to marry a *Blackmore*, or an ugly Scold, or Beggar: But the Bishop or King cannot oblige men to chose no better, because it is out of the Verge of their jurisdiction, and belongeth to personal and family power. It is lawful to put my self into the Hospital, and care of an unskilful Physician, till my health require better: But when my health requireth it, I will use a better if I can, whoever forbids it. For it is usurpation in them, that shall take the necessary care of my health and life out of my own hands. It is lawful to give the King our estates: But Lawyers say, we are not bound to do it, meerly because He or the Bishop commandeth it.

But perhaps you think, that men may do more against our souls than against our bodies; and have more power in Religion than in civil or bodily things: But we are not bound to think so if you do. It is lawful for men to hear one that only readeth the Scripture and Liturgy, and never preacheth: But when my needs requireth more, I will use it if I can, whoever forbids me. It is lawful to hear an ignorant raw Lad, that saith over a dry Sermon as a Boy saith his lesson, and hath neither spiritual Life nor Light, nor is fit to take the Charge of Souls: And it is lawful to hear such a Sermon as yours, or one that peacheth against other mens preaching: Yea, we rejoyce, and will rejoyce, that Christ is preached, though by such as do it in strife and contention

to

to add affliction to the afflicted, and not ſincerely: But wiſe men that believe a life to come, and love their ſouls, will chooſe better if they can, whoever forbiddeth them. Men have no power to hurt our ſouls, nor to deprive us of the help which God affordeth us, nor to make themſelves the only Judges, what is profitable or hurtful to our ſouls or bodies, or what is beſt for our edification.

§ 37. But [*To commit a fault in hearing us*] is of doubtful ſignification. In the manner of hearing, all commit faults; by ſome defect of attention, faith or application: But that's not it that you mean: But that *it is their ſin to hear us.* And indeed, if this were true, is it above your learning to underſtand, that it is lawful to preach to them that commit a fault in hearing them.

1. What if culpably they would hear no other? Is it better let them hear none at all, than that we preach to them? If peeviſhneſs or ſickneſs make a Child refuſe the Food or Phyſick which he ſhould take by his parents command; will you ſay, that it is better that he famiſh or die, than that you give him any other? Men may be ſaved that hear not you: But how can they believe, unleſs they hear, or hear without a Preacher? The means is for the End: *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, is a Leſſon which I perceive more than the *Phariſees* are to learn. Order is for the thing Ordered: Pariſh-Order is not ſo needful as Faith and Salvation. It may be, ſuch a mans Sin, that he will not hear ſuch as he ſhould hear; and ſo by Conſequence that he heareth me, and yet alſo Conſequently his Duty to hear me, ſuppoſing that his fault hath blinded him, to think that he may hear no other, till his Errour be Cured: Or at leaſt, it is my Duty to take him as I find him, and Preach to him in his own miſtake.

2. The Canon forbids going out of our own Pariſhes: ſuppoſe *twenty or five Hundred* Infidels, or Papiſts of the next Pariſh reſolved, we will hear no Proteſtant but Dr. *Stillingfleet*; were it unlawful for you to Preach to them?

3. If I ſhould Preach to them all againſt ſeparation, and for Prelacy, were it unlawful? One of the Doctors at the *Savoy*, 1661. motioned, that he and I might go up and down *England* to Preach for Conformity: and if any ask us why we do not, we may tell them, Dr. *Stillingfleet* taketh it for unlawful: If it be a Sin to preach to them, it is a ſin to preach to them againſt Separation, or for Conformity.

4. It is ordinary for men of other Pariſhes to hear you, and Dr. *Tillotſon*, and others, ſuch as you eſteem: And I ſuppoſe

most weekly Lectures are Preached most to men of other Parishes, and yet you take it not for sin to preach to them.

5. It is ordinary for many Protestants to go hear and Communicate with the *French* or *Dutch* Churches which differ from you in the Mode of Worship: And yet I never heard it proved, that it is a sin for the Preachers thus to preach to them.

6. What if your Children as Prodigals over-run you, or the Kings Subjects causelesly fly into another Land: They ought not to be there. Is it therefore unlawful, for any to teach them there, or receive them to publike Worship?

7. Almost all the Christian World, is so tainted with some degree of Errour and Partiality, that men will hear none but those of their own mind, for their Errour sake. The *Armenians*, *Abassims*, *Greeks*, *Papists*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Lutherans*, *Arminians*, *Calvinists*, *Anabaptists*, &c. It is unlawful for any of these, to refuse sounder Teachers than their own, and to Confine themselves to their own only meerly for their singular Opinions: And yet it will be hard for you to prove, that all the Preachers on Earth, must give over Preaching to any such as these. What shame, Blood, and odious Schismes, followed this Schismatical Principle, while in doubtful Disputations, or tolerable differences, each party Condemned and Cursed the other, I have fully manifested in my Abridgment of Church History. While by one Emperour and Council all the Orthodox were Deposed; and by another, all the *Nestorians*; and by another, all the *Eutichians*; and by another, all the *Monothelites*; and by another, the *Corrupticolæ*; and by another, the *Iconoclasts*; and so on; How few were there un-Cursed, and un-Condemned in the Roman World? And this keepeth the Churches in Schism to this day.

8. Do not you thus teach the Nonconformists to requite you with the like; and by your own Rule to judg it unlawful for you to Preach. They judg indeed, that it is lawful to hear you; 1. When better cannot be had, without greater hurt than benefit. 2. To shew their judgment by their Practise, *viz.* that they separate not from you as no Church, nor take it for simply unlawful to have Communion with you: But they that think Conformity as great a sin as they have told you, they fear it would be to them, must needs think that it is a fault in those that choose your Assemblies, when *cæteris paribus*, and without greater hurt than good, they might have better. And must we therefore conclude, that it is unlawful for you to Preach. Suppose it were but, when we had the Kings Licence. Or, if in the times of

Usurpation

Uſurpation, any thought to leave the Pariſh Churches tended Culpably to Diviſion: It followeth not, that it was unlawful for a Biſhop to preach in private, though when you, under the Uſurpers, kept the *Pariſh* Church, he had preacht to ſome of your Flock.

But here you ſhew what your Labour tendeth to, *viz.* To prove it Unlawful for us to Preach, that you may perſwade Us to give over. If *God* will, I ſhall elſewhere give you an Account of the Reaſons of our Preaching; and Anſwer what You, and Others ſay againſt it: And therefore, ſhall ſay but little of it here. But I am heartily ſorry, that you are come to ſuch a Deſire: That you had rather ſo many *Hundred* ſuch Miniſters were Silenced, than ſuffered to Preach without your Covenants, and Ceremonies! That you no more regard the Needs of the People, that abound in Ignorance, Careleſneſs, and Vice; nor obſerve no more the Power of Sin, nor the great Want of Help to ſuch Pariſhes, as your own, and too many in the Land, that have need on other Accounts.

O! How dreadful and unſearchable are the Judgments of *God*? That when ſo many *Hundreds* were Forbidden to Preach the Goſpel, the Plague muſt firſt give them ſome Degree of Liberty, and the Flames continue it the next Year, and the *King*s Clemency after, and Horrid *Popiſh* Treaſon next divert their Proſecutors; while the Laws and Biſhops all the while forbad them: Even when the Pariſh-Preachers fled from the Plague, and it was dying Men that the *Nonconformiſts* Preach't to. And when the Churches were Burnt down, and the People had no Prieſt, or Place to go to for their own way of Worſhip; yet neither Laws nor Biſhops conſented to our Preaching: And ſuch Men as Dr. *Stillingfleet* alſo, come in to engage their Wit, Reputation, Induſtry, and Conſcience, in the Silencing Deſign. O! What Cauſe have we all to VVatch and Pray, That *We enter not into Temptation?* and to dread the Spiritual Judgments of *God*? *Remember* Lot's *Wife*, was a needful Warning. A *Solomon*, that is Numbred with the Wiſeſt Men, may be ſet up as a Frightful Monument, to bid us *Take heed, leſt we Revolt.*

And I take it for a greater Injury to us, to perſwade us to Silence our ſelves; than to perſwade the Magiſtrate only, to Silence, Baniſh, or Impriſon us: For ſo to Suffer from another, is not our Sin. But Sacrilegiouſly to break our Miniſterial Vow, and forſake the Calling, which we were Solemnly Vowed to, and

this

this while the Neceſſity of Souls cry for Help; is a Sin, which few Men are ſo bad, as to perſwade us to with open Face, without ſome pious fraudulent Pretence.

§. 38. Serm. p. 20. [*I do not confound bare Suſpending Communion, in ſome particular Rites, which Perſons do modeſtly Scruple, and uſing it in what they judge to be Lawful; with either total, or ordinary Forbearance of Communion, in what they judge to be Lawful; and proceeding to the Forming of Separate Congregations,* i. e. *under other Teachers, and by other Rules, than what the Eſtabliſhed Religion alloweth. And this is the preſent Caſe of Separation, which I intend to conſider, and to make the Sinfulneſs, and the Miſchievouſneſs appear.*

Anſw. I am ſure, I am one that you expreſly Charge, as of this Number; and I can beſt ſpeak for my ſelf, and thoſe of my Acquaintance. 1. Is it true, that I *totally* or *ordinarily* forbear?

2. What mean you by [*Forming*] *a Congregation?* If their *Preſence* be my *Forming* them, it is but becauſe I ſpeak to them: For, I neither Perſwade nor Drive them to be there. But if you mean, *Forming* them into a *Diſtinct Church*, and becoming their *Paſtor*, I was never Related as a *Paſtor*, to any *Church*, but *Kiderminſter*; nor have theſe Twenty Years, been a *Paſtor* to any; but borrowed other Mens Pulpits, to Preach a Lecture to ſuch as ſay they need it.

3. Your word [*Separate*,] I have Examined before. You Separate from My Auditory, and more than Separate; and I Separate not from Yours: Who then is the *Separatiſt?*

4. All the Pariſhes about you, and the Biſhop of *Ely* in your Pariſh, that judge it Lawful to Hear you, yet are Abſent from you; and ſo are ſome *Nonconformiſts*, that think they muſt Preach themſelves; and cannot be in Two Places at once. Is that Separating?

5. The *French* and *Dutch* Churches do all that, which you here deſcribe, as *Sinful* and *Miſchievous*; only they have more Leave, than we.

6. Is all the Matter, that *We are Teachers, which the Law alloweth not?* So were the *Orthodox* under the *Neſtorian*, *Eutychian*, *Monothelite*, &c. Princes. And ſo I have proved, That the Chriſtian Religion hath been much propagated in the VVorld.

7. VVhat are the *Rules* which we go by, which the Eſtabliſhed Religion alloweth not? Doth it not allow the *Sacred Scriptures?*

Scriptures? Or, Have you proved, That I go by any other *Rule?* If the *Act of Uniformity*, or the *Canons* be your Religion, Do not they allow *God*'s VVord? Or, if they be your *Rules, omitting that*, Is not *Using another?* Yet those that do Join in Churches under Chosen Pastors, when I do not, I shall not Condemn, till I hear their Reasons: They may have more Cause, than I have.

§. 39. Serm. p. 21. [*They Unanimously confess they find no fault with the Doctrine of our Church.*]

Answ. 1. And yet are you one that would have them all Silenced? 2 But this is not true: You name *Four* or *Five*, and then say [*Unanimously*;] and this because they offer to Subscribe the Doctrine of the *Thirty Nine* Articles: And yet I suppose you know, that they more Unanimously dissent from the Doctrinal Article in the Liturgy of *Baptized Infants*, certain *undoubted Salvation* without Exception, and some of them to the *Doctrinal Damnation* of all Condemned in *Athanasius* Creed; And some of your selves, as well as Mr. *Humphrey*, could wish the Article against *Free-Will*, and that which Damneth all the Heathens, and some others, had been otherwise than they are.

§. 40. [*They generally yield, that our Parochial Churches are true Churches; and it is with these that Communion is required.*]

Say you so? 1. The *Diocesans* are little beholden to you, if this be all! Do you require no Communion with them.

2. I think I shall shew you anon, that you take your Parishes for no true Church your self: At least your chief Brethren do not, who make them but Parts of a Church, the *Diocesane* being the lowest proper Church.

3. Are you sure, that the *Independents* take your Parishes for true Churches? *I* cannot tell. But *I* know *John Goodwin* and Mr. *Brown* have Writ to the Contrary.

4. And for my self, how oft have *I* told you, that *I* distinguish, and take those for true Churches, that have true Pastors (but that is, because I judge of their office by Gods Word, and not by the Rule which depriveth them of an essential part of the Office of a Pastor of a true Church.) But *I* take those for no true Churches, that have, 1. Men uncapable of the Pastoral office. 2. Or not truly called to it. 3. Or that deny themselves to have the power essential to a Pastor. Such Congregations *I* can joyn with, as Chappels or Oratories: But they are

not

not Churches of the political organized form which we ſpeak of, as wanting an eſſential part.

§ 41. Next you tell men, what *I* ſaid in print, of our *Concluſion, that communion with you,* was lawful.] *Anſ.* This is true: and when ſaid we otherwiſe? Dr. *Manton,* Dr. *Bates,* Dr. *Jacomb,* Mr. *Poole* and others were there! *I* told you before, how *far lawful.*

§ 42. Serm. p. 22. [*Who could have Imagined, but they ſhould have all joyned with us, in what themſelves judged to be lawful, and in many Caſes a duty. But inſtead of this, we have rather ſince that time, found them more inclinable to courſes of ſeparation,* &c.]

Anſ. If this be not true, *I* take it not for ſinleſs. Since that ime, 1. Mr. *Pool,* Mr. *Humphery,* my ſelf and others, that took our ſelves to be no Paſtors to any particular Church, have uſually joyned in your aſſemblies; and I uſually keep to my Pariſh-Church.

2. Since that time, in a Treaty ſet on foot by the Lord-keeper *Bridgman,* we agreed *in terminis,* with Biſhop *Wilkins,* and Dr. *Burton*; and Judge *Hale* drew up our Agreement into the form of an Act.

3. Since that time, at your own motion, we treated with honeſt Dr. *Tillotſon* and you; and the ſame men and more, conſented to the form and words of an agreeing Act, and you both ſeemed to conſent.

4. Where you read my words, you might have read the Reaſon, why no more Communicated with you. And it is not like a lover of Truth to diſſemble them; 1. *I* told you, that even at the preſent, new heats ariſing againſt Diſſenters, we thought it our duty, till they were over, to forbear a lawful thing; which was like to occaſion the ſufferings of ſuch as in that were not ſatisfied as we were. Marriage is lawful: But if it be not neceſſary, one may forbear it, if it would ruine another, though the Biſhop command it him. 2. I told you, that the *Oxford* Act of confinement, came out when we were intending to come to your Churches: and then had we been ſeen there in the City or Corporations, we had been ſent to Jayle: but many in the Countries came to your Churches. This is your Cathedrall Juſtice; The Law is [*come to Church in London,* &c. and you ſhall go to Jayle ſix Months.] And if we do not, ſuch as you tell the World, that we are Separatiſts. 3. *I* told you, men cannot preach to others, and hear you both at once. Muſt we repeat theſe things as oft as you accuſe us?

§. 43. In

§ 43. In the charge are joyned Dr. *Owen* and my ſelf, my error is [*p.* 24. *Serm.* ' *that to deviſe new Species of Churches (beyond Parochial* ' *or Congregational without Gods authority, and to impoſe them on the world* ' *yea in his name) and call all diſſenters Schiſmaticks, is a far worſe uſur-* ' *pation than to make or impoſe new Ceremonies or Liturgies*].

Anſ. A man would think that this doctrine ſhould juſtifie it ſelf and confute the Accuſer. 1. Will you own your Churches *de Specie* to be new, and yet appeal to antiquity? 2. Will you own them to be *deviſed without Gods authority*, and yet to be preferred to thoſe that he inſtituted? 3. Will you own that yet *they may in his name be impoſed* on the *World*? 4. And will you own that for theſe, *diſſenters* may be called *Schiſmaticks*? 5. And is not this a worſe uſurpation than to make new Ceremonies? If you will plead for ſo much preſumption, profanation of Gods Name, uſurpation, uncharitableneſs, and Schiſm, I will leave you to fight againſt the Light, and not labour in vain in a needleſs confutation. 2. But, Sir, you ſhould have told your Reader the full truth. 1. That I never denied but largely aſſerted the Magiſtrates power of the Sword over all perſons and cauſes eccleſiaſtical; much leſs *Chriſtian Kingdoms*, or Cities *de re*. 2. And that I maintained that Magiſtrates make officers to judge of the *Circa ſacra*; or undetermined accidents of Religion; 3. And if you will equivocally call theſe Churches, I quarrel not *de nomine*. 4. Nor yet at the thing or name of the Aſſociation of many Churches for Concord. 5. But I ſay (in the Page cited by you) that as humane forms ſhould not be pretended falſly to be Divine, ſo neither have they authority againſt thoſe that are Divine, to change them and deſtroy their priviledges: Unleſs you will fight for man againſt God, you muſt reverſe this Accuſation.

§ 44. As to your caſe, of the extent of the firſt Churches, I have ſo much to ſay of it elſewhere, if God will, that I ſhall not here ſtay on ſo ſhort a touch. Only you put me to repeat, *If God make families, and men make Cities*, do but confeſs the different efficients, and uſurp not a power to deſtroy the power inſtituted by God, and we ſhall not much differ.

§ 45. You greatly ſtrengthen my Cauſe by the teſtimony of ſo well Read a man [Serm. *p.* 27. ' [*Though when the Churches increaſed, the oc-* ' *caſional meetings were freequent in ſeveral places, yet ſtill there was but* ' *one Church, and one Altar, and one Baptiſm, and one Biſhop, with many* ' *Presbyters aſſiſting him: And this is ſo very plain in Antiquity, as to the* ' *Churches planted by the Apoſtles themſelves in ſeveral parts, that none but* ' *a great ſtranger to the Hiſtory of the Church can ever call in queſtion.*

Anſ. Biſhop *Gunning* will give you no thanks for this, It ſeems after all the anger we are much agreed. I never denied Chappels to a Church, nor thought they muſt all meet at once. If they all meet

ter vices at *one Altar*, they are aſſociated for *preſential Communion*, and not *diſtant* only, and this is that I am for. Make it but ſuch a Church that meet at one Altar, and that can know one another, and are aſſociated for ſuch perſonal Communion in preſence, and (though I could wiſh it neither too ſmall nor too great) it is of the *Species* which I plead for as of God. There is certainly a Specifique difference between a Church that hath a Conſtitutive formal Governour, who hath the whole Paſtoral power, and is aſſociated for preſential mutual help in faith worſhip and holy living, and one that either hath but a half Paſtor without the power of the Keyes, or that is aſſociated only for diſtant Communion, and never ſee each other; even for another ſort of Communion. Conformiſts hold that Biſhops and Presbyters are diſtinct *orders*: Therefore Churches differing in the very *Order* or *Species* of the Conſtitutive Governours, and in the Triminus or end, and the nature of the Communions are certainly of diſtinct Species, and not only of diſtinct degrees in the ſame Species: But ſuch are our Parochial and *Dioceſan* Churches. Juſt ſuch a Church as you here deſcribe is it that I would have, and yet if the Chappels alſo have Altars, and there be more than one to the Church, as long as they are under the ſame Biſhop and Presbyters, aſſociate for Communion in preſence, it alters not the Species.

'§ 46. I thank you alſo for adding *p.* 28. [*'And yet this diſtri-'bution even in Creet was ſo uncommon in thoſe Elder times, that Epi-'phanius takes notice of it as an extraordinary thing at Alexandria and ther-'fore it is probably ſuppoſed that there was no ſuch thing in all the 'Cities in his time*],

Anſ. 1. Its true of *Creet*, which had an hundred Cities: But your [therefore] makes me think, you put *Creet* for *Cyprus*: For there it was that *Epiphanius* was a Biſhop. 2. But you grant me the foundation of all my cauſe. Let the Dioceſs or Pariſh or Church (call it what you will) be no bigger than that the ſame Biſhop may performe the true Paſtoral office to them in *preſent* Communion, and not only by writs, and delegates, rule men that have no perſonal preſent Communion, nor ever intend it as the end of their relation, and I have my deſire as to the Species of the loweſt ſort of Churches. *1 Theſ.* 5. 12. 13. *Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you.* But ſuch are not thoſe whom we never ſaw nor heard, and never laboured among or admoniſhed the twentieth or fortieth or hundredth Congregation in their Dioceſs, and whom the people cannot know.

Heb. 13. 7. *Remember them which have rule over you, who have ſpoken to you the word of God, whoſe faith follow, conſidering the end of their converſation.*

tion. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your Souls as thoſe that muſt give account.* But ſuch are not they that the people never heard the word of God from, nor knew their converſation nor the men: And Biſhop *Taylor* ſaith, *No man can give account of thoſe that he knoweth not*; that is, Paſtors account. Make Pariſhes true Churches, and reſtore them Church diſcipline, and we are ſatisfied.

'§ 47. *Serm. p.* 29. [*If we look over the ancient Cannons of the 'Church, we ſhall find two things very plain in them:* 1. *That the notion 'of a Church was the ſame with that of a Dioceſs; or ſuch a number of 'Chriſtians as were under the inſpection of a Biſhop.*]

Anſ. 1. Very true; and the Biſhop was their ordinary Preacher, and only pronounced the bleſſing &c. Therefore till the Species was altered it was like a School, whoſe Schollars lived in City and Country, but were under a Biſhop that Governed them perſonally in preſence. But after they were like many ſcore or hundred Schools that had Teaching Uſhers, and one abſent Governour (to the moſt). To Govern as a Schoolmaſter in preſence ſpecifically differs from Governing as Princes or viſitors, by Laws, or extraordinary inſpection.

2. I pray you forget not that by this meaſure (if you hold to it) you unchurch all our Pariſh Churches: Every Church then had a Biſhop, no Pariſh now hath a Biſhop (proper to it ſelf), or at leaſt not many: Therefore no Pariſh (by this rule) is a Church. *Eccleſia eſt plebe Epiſcopo adunata.* You make no Church below a Dioceſs.

'§ 48. Serm. [2. *That thoſe Presbyters who rejected the authority 'of their Biſhop or affected Seperate meetings, where no fault could be found 'with the Doctrine of a Church, were condemned of Schiſm*].

Anſ. Good ſtill: They were not to ſet up *altare contra altare*, but joyn with the Biſhop in Governing the ſame Church in preſent Communion at leaſt *per vices*: But if a Biſhop than had put down a hundred or a thouſand Biſhops and Churches about him, and ſaid, you ſhall be all but one Church in another ſort of Communion, and I will be your only Biſhop, Chriſtians then would have abhorred him: Now we have hundreds of Altars locally ſeparated from the Biſhop.

2. But yet if then the Doctrine of faith had been never ſo ſound, Chriſtians would have ſeparated. 1. From unlawful worſhip (ſpecially Idolatry), 2. And from wicked Biſhops; as the forementioned Epiſtle of *Cyprian* and the Carthage Council ſheweth.

'§ 49. You Confeſs *Martin* and *Theognoſtus* ſeparation from the

Synods and Communion of the neighbour Biſhops: And if it were not lawful for neighbours to communicate with them, I ſhall believe as *Cyprian*, that the ſame reaſon would at leaſt warrant the people to forſake them, till you ſhew reaſon to the contrary. And you confeſs the Joannites ſeparation, and only ſay that after they returned. Its true: But did they do well or ill before? they returned not till gentleneſs and honouring *Chryſoſtome* reduced them: and though *Cyril Alex.* called them Schiſmaticks and ſaid it was fitter the Church Canons ſhould be kept, than ſuch refractory Nonconformiſts gratified by reſtoring the honour of their ejected Paſtor, yet *Atticus* had more wit and honeſty then to follow his Council or be moved by his threatning; Our caſe hath ten times more to be ſaid for it, than the Joannites had, who were not caſt out, but departed, nor had any Impoſitions forced on them, which they took to be many hainous ſins. Had you been impartial, you had eaſily ſeen this: But as *Cyril* and others accuſation of the Joannites, as ſeparatiſts and ſchiſmaticks, did not finally attain his ends againſt the Joannites, no more ſhall yours againſt the more excuſable. In an Ale-houſe or Crowd of the debauched or ignorant [*They are Puritans, Presbyterians, Fanaticks, Separatiſts, Schiſmaticks, Hereticks, Rogues*] is effectual arguing and convincing, and ſome preachers it ſeems take their hearer for ſuch Judges; But men will be men, and reaſon will be reaſon, and truth will be truth, and innocency will be innocency, and pride, and ſlander will ſhame their Authors more than the ſlandered, when you and I are dead and gone.

'§ 50. Serm. p. 30. [*But ſuppoſe the firſt Churches were barely Congregational by reaſon of the ſmall number of believers at that time, yet what Obligation lies upon us to diſturb the peace, of the Church we live in to reduce Churches to their infant State*] And here is mentioned 'the *community of Goods, waſhing Feet*, and then [*They believe that the 'firſt civil Government was appointed by God himſelf over families: Do 'they therefore think themſelves bound to overthrow Kingdomes to bring things 'back to their firſt inſtitution*, &c.]

Anſ. 1. We call them not [*barely Congregational*] but [*aſſociated for perſonal Communion*] If all the Kingdom had but one Biſhop, that were another Species of Government and Communion than Parochial.

2. If one like you ſhould plead for turning all the families in *London* into one, and making only one Common Father or Maſter of a families, who ſhould ſend Stewards to every houſe, of his own making, to give them their victuals, he only being the proper Govournour, and this man ſhould plead as you do, that it is *diſturbing the peace of the great family*, to reduce them to their Infant State, by reſtoring

ſtoring particular families, more wit or reputation than yours would not keep his cauſe from ſhame. Or if he pleaded that all the Schools in a Dioceſs, or many 100 or 1000, ſhould have but one Schoolmaſter with Uſhers that have no power to take in or put out or uſe the Rod, and that to retrive this to the Infant State is ſeditious, the reaſon of mankind would ſhame his reaſoning. And when men know *what Paſtoral Guidance* is, the caſe here will be as plain.

3. Our Reaſon for deſiring (not the Primitive paucity of Chriſtians, but) the Primitive form of Chriſt is. 1. Becauſe Chriſt by his Apoſtles inſtituted it: (Mr. *Thorndike* once ſpake well to that). 2. Becauſe we can prove that he was faithful in forming his houſe and Church, as *Moſes* was in forming that of the Jews. 3. Becauſe we never heard it proved that man had power to alter what Chriſt by his Spirit in the Apoſtles founded: neither having their infallibility nor commiſſion. 4. At leaſt we think it is the ſureſt way to hold to that which we are ſure God ſetled, till we can prove that men have power to change the very form.

4. Teach us what to ſay to the Papiſts, when they ſhall accordingly ſay to us '[*what though there was no Univerſal Paſtor in the Primi-*'*tive times? what though many things in diſcipline and worſhip be changed* '*ſince? why muſt you diſturb the peace of the Church by reducing things to* '*the infant State? what though there were no Cardinals, nor General* '*Councils of Prelates to make univerſal Lawes for the Churches, what* '*though the Sacrament was given in both kinds, and there were no private* '*Maſſes, or prayers for the dead? muſt the Church be ſtill in infancy? What* '*though the Apoſtles inſtituted the Lords day for publick worſhip and holy* '*Communion, may not the Church put that down, and ſet up one day of her* '*making once a month or year inſtead of it?*

But I will not be one of thoſe that will *fight for man* againſt God; for I know who will overcome. If you can prove that Chriſt gave your Church authority to pull down the Church Offices and form which he appointed, and ſet up another, and call it the *Churches growth*, or emendation, I will obey them.

But I have elſewhere asked who they were that made your new Church form. If the firſt Church (of Gods making) it was only the *univerſal* headed by Chriſt, and particular Churches for perſonal Communion, if theſe made the new forms, tell us who, when, and by what power, and why they may not unmake them, if there be cauſe: and whether the efficient Church be not better then the effected: as the Parent than the Child. If you ſay that Biſhops of Pariſhes did it by conſent in *Aſia* or elſewhere above a thouſand years ago, how come we in *England* to be bound by them? If you ſay that Princes were the

makers

makers of the new *Church Species*. 1. Heathen Princes did it not. 2. The Biſhops will give you little thanks, if you grant not that it was *done* before there were any Chriſtian Princes to do it. 3. One Prince cannot make Laws for anothers Country. 4. Prove that ever Chriſt authorized Princes to change the Conſtitution of the Churches inſtituted by him, and make new ones above his form; except making officers for the *Circa Sacra* or variable accidents. 5. And what Princes do, they have power to undo.

And it concerneth us to enquire (much more then about ceremonies) how far this power of man extendeth. May they make as many new Church *Species* as they pleaſe. Why then may they not make as many forms as there are Kingdomes, if not an univerſal Pope by the conſent of moſt?

5. But that which the Papiſts take for the Churches growth from Infancy, the Proteſtants take for its gradual depravation; And have written many treatiſes to ſhew when and how ſuch corruptions were introduced: And the forementioned book of *Paulus Sarpi Servita* lately tranſlated, tells us by what degrees much of that evil did ſpring up, which ſome take to be the Churches Manhood, and the amending of the defects of Chriſts inſtitutions.

6. And you that wonder that I know not what you mean by [*the Church of* England] may next wonder that I know not what it is that you call [*the Proteſtant Religion*] In my [*full ſatisfaction*] I have told you that I mean by it, *ſimple Chriſtianity expreſſed in the ſacred Scriptures as the Recorded rule, with the rejection of all humane additions which ſuppoſe the Scriptures imperfect as to their regulating uſe:* But if you ſuppoſe that men may, without any Scripture proof of authority, take down and change the Church Species, which Chriſt by his Apoſtles made, and make new ones inſtead, and thus add to Chriſts Laws, equal, yea ſuperior and derogating Laws of their own, this is not that *Proteſtant Religion* which I am of, and therefore I intreat you to define what it is you ſo call.

7. When you have as well proved the very eſſential form of the firſt Churches to have been inſtituted but *pro tempore* as a mutable thing, as we can prove the like of *waſhing Feet*, and *community* of *Goods*, we will ſubmit. And ſo we will when you have proved that God that *made families* made not Cities or Republicks, that is, did not inſtitute civil Government of many families; or that men who diverſifie the forms of Republicks, may overthrow families or their proper power: Yea and that God hath left men as much power to make new *Species* of Churches, as to diverſifie the Forms of Commonwealht.

8. And

8. And as to our [*disturbing your peace*] if you had built your frame on Christs foundation, and laid your peace on the unity of the Spirit, and the seven particulars named *Eph.* 4. 45. 6. and had not built it on uncharitableness, on imperious usurpation, nor that love of the world, which *Paul Servita* saith brought in the Church corruptions, you would not have been so tender, nor your peace like an aspen leaf in the wind, as that your Brethren who, you say, agree in Doctrine and the substance of worship with you, cannot quietly joyn near you in the worship of God, without your imposed words, and ceremonies, but they become disturbers of your peace. Its a sickly peace that is so easily disturbed by so small dissent. As *Rome* thinketh that all wrong her that do not obey her, and pleadeth for *Empire* under the name of Communion, so do some others; and will enter a suite against them as *Schismatiks*, that will not let them ride and lash them without complaint. If you have the humility and Charity of a Christian, without envy *&c.* What harm doth it do you that I and such others worship God in another room, without your book, while your Church is as full as it can well hold? Do you not differ much more among your selves; as I before shewed? And the Papists yet more among themselves; and yet are in one Church, and tolerated. But so their *Power* and *Wills* may be obeyed, some men can bear with much more against God. Who heareth such out cries against ten thousand or twenty thousand in a Parish that come not to any Church at all, as against a few Christians that pray and preach without your book? what Informers, what indictments, what prosecutions, what invectives are equally against all these aforesaid?

'§ 51. Serm. *p.* 31. [*It is very uncertain whether the Primitive form* 'were such as they fancy &c, *but its certainly our duty to preserve peace and* 'unity amongst *Christians*].

Ans. 1. Then it is certainly a sin to make racks to tear them, and make concord impossible, and say, none shall have Communion with us, that will not say and Swear what we bid them, and that think any thing sin which we impose; and to shut men out by Canonical Excommunication, and then call them Schismaticks in Presse and Pulpit for not coming in.

2. If it be *uncertain whether that which* we desire be the *Primitive form*, it is uncertain then whether you oppose not and fight not against the Primitive form.

3. What you say is uncertain I shall God willing prove certain elsewhere (and have done). All is not uncertain to others which is so to you.

4. Mark

4. Mark this, you that are for the *Divine right* of *Epiſcopacy as the Primitive forme inſtituted by Chriſt*; As he taketh it for *uncertain* (as beyond Congregational formes). ſo were it ſo, if the Church ſhould caſt it out, he ſeemeth to hold your endeavours to reduce it, to be a ſinful breaking of the Churches peace. You are diſturbers if in *Holland*, *Geneva*, *Helvetia*, you would reduce them to that which you ſuppoſe to be the Primitive form. *It may be it was but from the circumſtances of the times:* And ſo the head of the Church hath made no particular Church *Species*, but left all to the better wit of men (who knowes to whom).

'§ 52. Serm. [*It is impoſſible ſo to do, if men break all orders 'in pieces, for the fancy they have taken up of a Primitive* Platform].

Anſ. Anglice, [It is impoſſible to *preſerve Peace and unity among Chriſtians*, if men will not ſuppoſe that Chriſt never inſtituted his own Church formes, or will not forſake his Inſtitutions, but fancy that they muſt be conformable thereto, and will not preferre the wills and commands of Biſhops to whom they never conſented, and take it to be a breaking of all orders in pieces, not to do all that they enjoyn us, though we take it to be heynous ſin, and will not give over Gods worſhip and our Miniſtry when they forbid us. *Dan. 6. We ſhall find no fault againſt this* Daniel, *except it be concerning the Law of his God*, but if he pray openly when forbidden, away with him to the Lyons for the Laws of the *Medes* and *Perſians* are more inflexible than Gods.

§53. As to what you ſay of *preferring Morals* and the *ends*, it is more truly than prudently mentioned as to your cauſe: For the *very* naming of it will make the Readers think, *whether your ſubmiſſion and declaration and oaths* and impoſed practices, which the Nonconformiſts judge unlawful, be greater matters than their preaching the Goſpel, avoiding great ſins, the concord and ſtrength of the Proteſtant Churches, and the avoding temptations to wrath, and perſecution and diviſions which will be bitter in the latter end. *Go learn what this meaneth I will have mercy and not Sacrifice*; (or needleſs Ceremony)

'§ 54. Serm. *p.* 32 [*Men may pleaſe themſelves in talking of preſerv-'ing peace and Love under ſeparate Communions: But our own ſad ex-'perience ſhews the contrary: For as nothing tends more to unite mens hearrs 'than joyning together in the ſame Prayer and Sacraments; ſo nothing doth 'more alienate mens affections, than withdrawing from each other into ſepar-'ate Congregations*].

Anſ. 1. But do all ſeparate from you that are in other Pariſh Churches than yours; if not, do all ſeparate that differ, as Cathedrals from

from Pariſh Churches, or as conforming *Preachers* do from one another: If not, do they ſeparate that omit a form or ceremony of yours?

2. I am ſorry, if you have experience of the *alienating of your affections* from your neighbours, that quietly worſhip God by you: but its like you know what you ſay: For my part many of them have ſaid and written more againſt me, them againſt you, and, I thank God, I love them heartily; yea and that your own party from whom I have ſuffered far more. It is mens diſeaſes that make them impatient of a croſs opinion or word or cenſure, and then they cry out of mens unpeaceableneſs: As *Seneca* ſaith, *They that are ſore complain if they but think their ſore is touched.*

3. Let the Magiſtrates keep Peace and puniſh all that abuſe their brethren.

4. But we eaſily grant to you, that when men do not only differ, but fly from each others Communion as unlawful, it hath a great tendency to the alienations and evils which you mention. Had we not thought ſo, we had never ſtoopt, and pleaded, and begg'd of the Biſhops to prevent or heal it as we did 1660, and 1661. And wo to the impenitent that are the cauſe of all, and to this day will not be perſwaded by all the ſad experience that they complain of.

Sir, inſtead of all your accuſations and reaſonings, it would have better diſpatched all the buſineſs, would you but conſider, *who it is that muſt cure the diſtance which you complain of*? I have fully proved to you in my book of *Concord that we are utterly unable to remedy* it. If you will not know, who can make you know. Do you think, that when you ſay to all the Land [*ſay and do all that is impoſed, or you ſhall not be admitted to our Communion*] that it is morally poſſible to make all good Chriſtians agree in believing that it is all lawful? or to make them all do that which they think to be unlawful? I muſt freely tell you, that he that thinks that his own or any others reaſonings will ever ſo far change all the truly honeſt Chriſtians in the Land, knoweth ſo little of matters, men or Conſcience, as that he is unmeet to be a Biſhop or a Prieſt.

But is the remedy impoſſible to the *Impoſers*? I am aſhamed to debate the queſtion: But ſome men are ſo learned and wiſe, that they will not quench the fire in a City, nor ſave the Ship from ſinking, no forbear ſilencing Chriſts Miniſters and ſcattering the Flocks, as long as they can but ſay, *There will ſuch or ſuch an inconvenience follow.* It would coſt you *nothing* to cure all this, which it is impoſſible for us to cure. Therefore all your juſt aggravations of the miſchiefs of ſchiſm or ſeparation fall where it concerneth ſome of you to look to it, if you believe that there is a future Judgement; rather than to call your ſelves Schiſmaticks under the name of others, and put God and man to ſay, *Thou art the man.*

§ 55. *Pag.* 33. You come to me, for denying that I separate causelessly from the '*Communion of true Churches*, or set up *Antichurches*, '[*though* (say you) *they preach when and where it is forbidden by Law*, '*and administer Sacraments by other Rules and after a different manner than* '*what our Church requireth*: *This is not dealing with us with that fairness* '*and ingenuity which our former brethren used* — *they deny the fact which* '*is evident to all persons*: *For do they not the very same things and in the* '*same manner that the others do*. *How comes it to be then separation in* '*some and not in others*. *They are very unwilling to confess a separation be-* '*cause they have formerly condemned it with great severity, and yet they do* '*the same things for which they charged others as guilty of a sinful separati-* '*on*.] And I am cited.

Answ. 1. This is like *H. Fowlis*; *The Puritans are the worst men on earth*: The Papist, are far prefer'd before them, *Because the Papists differ in fundamentals, but the Puritans take mass for a Ceremony*. So we are the most *disingenious* and not *fair dealers*, that own them to be true Churches and Ministers and hold Communion with them; and yet deny that we are Schismaticks or separate: We leave you therefore, to treat with the lesser *disingenious* and the fair dealers, that say you are no true Ministers, nor is it lawful to have Communion with men that openly avow such hainous sin, and covenant against ever endeavouring to reform notorious Church corruptions: because with such we are forbid even to eat, and commanded from such to turn away; Its well you have some more ingenious and fair dealers than I am.

But the disingenuity is my denying your accusation: I heard of a Gentleman that could silence any man: and his way was, he would accuse him (of Murther, Adultery, Theft or what his cause required) and if he denied it he would say; [*what will you make me a Lyar? To give me the Lie deserveth a stab.*] It is not only a crime if we do not *toto pectore telum recipere*, or with *Camero* unbutton our selves and say *feri miser*, or when ever we are beaten, confess that we deserved it: It's an odd kind of suit for a man that calleth an innocent man *traytor*, to bring his action against him, for saying, *you slander me*. But it is the name or thing that we must not deny. We will gratifie you in the first: I do seperate from your Church, by half a miles distance, and by going to my own parish, and by preaching my self, and so do most of the Parish Preachers, that will not sit hearing you when they should preach. But it is *de re*. And what is it, First I must tell the matter of fact: I never took any pastoral charge these twenty years; I gathered no Church: I never baptized one person: I never administred the Lords Supper once, in about eighteen or nineteen years; but of late seldom to some few, since aged weak persons who were in my

house

houſe, and near, who gave me ſpecial reaſon for it; and the Liturgy alloweth it to the ſick and all their friends that joyn with them: while I lived at *Acton* and *Toteridge* I went twice each Lords day to the publick Church, even to the beginning: Here I go when I am able uſually once a day to hear the Parſon of the Pariſh; and I communicate with them in the Sacrament: I preach twice a week in another mans Pulpit (borrowed) moſt to ſtrangers that I have no more to do with: My gain I thank them, the accuſer put me not to excuſe: I write and preach againſt Schiſm and all unjuſt ſeparation, and perſwade all to go no further from any than they go from Chriſt, or than they drive us away, or than we needs muſt, to avoid actual ſin. Well; now what is the crime of ſeparation?

1. I *preach* (you ſay) *when and where it is forbidden by Law.*] *Anſ.* Is this the *formal reaſon of ſeparation*? Then *diſobedience* and *ſeparation* are all one. I ſuppoſe you mean the Law of the King and the Parliament, and not the Canons ſave as by them made Laws: when I had given you ſo many Hiſtorical inſtances of the ancient Biſhops and Chriſtians, doing the like, and juſtified commonly by the Church: did you think while you ſilently paſs all that over, and all the reſt that I ſaid for my juſtification, that two lines of your ſaying was enough to confute all? Certainly it was not me that you meant to ſatisfie, nor any impartial man that had read my books. This dealing beſeemeth, not ſo weighty a Cauſe. You ſeem to ſay [*All preaching when and where it is forbidden by Law, is ſinful ſeparation: But*, &c. I deny the Major. The Primitive Preachers did ſo for three hundred years: The Orthodox did ſo afterwards under *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius* junior, *Anaſtaſius*, *Philippicus*, *Juſtinian* and many more: The *Albigenſes*, *Waldenſes* and *Bohemians* did ſo: The Reformers did ſo: The Proteſtants when the Interim was impoſed did ſo: *Epiſcopius* juſtifieth it at large, and the *Arminians* in *Belgia*, did ſo: The Martyrs in *England* and elſewhere did ſo. The Jeſuits in the *Eaſt Indies* did ſo. But what if the Law forbad you to preach at a certain hour—do you ſeparate from the Church, if you miſs your hour? They that Preacht Afternoon Sermons when forbidden were taken for diſobedient but not for ſeparatiſts. And what if when the Churches here were burnt the Miniſters had read the Liturgy and preacht in a place forbidden by the Law: Had that been ſeparation?

And how cometh [*when*] and [*where*] to be in, When we are forbidden *every time and in every place*, to preach to more than four. Is any *time* or *place* allowed us to preach in? You mean [*He is a ſeparatiſt who preacheth being forbidden by Law*: But I am ready to give you a fuller proof than is now to be offered on this occaſion, *that no man*

hath authority to forbid a faithful Miniſter of Chriſt, who forfeiteth not his Office-power, to perform the office to which he is ordained. And, Secondly, *that we remain under a Divine obligation to it, which ſuch a Law cannot diſſolve*, As Biſhop *Bilſon*, before ſaith [if Princes forbid us, we *muſt go on with our work:* what if the King had turned againſt Epiſcopacy and Liturgy, and forbad all the Epiſcopal to preach. Would you think it ſinful ſeparation to preach. By this you ſhew how eaſily you would lay down the work you are Vowed to, if the Law did but forbid you. How much then are Papiſt and Proteſtant Caſuiſts miſtaken, that ſay the Law is null that is againſt the common good, and that all power is only to edification.

And what limits do you ſet to this. Till you tell us, how can we judge of our ſeparation: what if an interdict ſilence all the Miniſters in a Kingdome, muſt all obey? What if it be moſt, muſt moſt obey? What if it be more then can be ſpared without the Churches wrong? And whoſe Laws be they that ſo binds us: Is it Infidel Princes or only Chriſtians. Is it Papiſts, Arrians, Eutychians, &c. or only the Orthodox? And do you ſet the people all to judge whether the King be Orthodox, as the rule of their obedience to his Laws. If I prove not that God bindeth me to preach, call me diſobedient, but yet that will not prove me a ſeparatiſt.

By this rule you may be a ſeparatiſt, as oft as the Law changeth, if you will not change as faſt as it. Yea though you Judge the Laws impoſitious to be hainous ſins, yet you muſt do them all or give over your Miniſtry: And ſo God muſt ask leave of the Rulers to be worſhiped as God. If he were a God of their making, they might put him down.

And, I think, it will prove confuſion and worſe diſobedience than our preaching is, to lay all the peoples obedience herein on their opinion of the Rulers Orthodoxneſs: no doubt, but the heathen and heretical Rulers are Governours even of the Church, though none hath power for deſtruction or againſt God. The Duke of *Brandenburghs* Subjects judge him not Orthodox: Are they therefore abſolved from obeying him in matters of Religion? *Calveniſts* Subjects think *Lutherane* Princes not Orthodox; and Proteſtants, in *France*, *Hungary*, *Poland*, judge their Papiſt Kings not Orthodox: Yea, what if we judge the Biſhops not Orthodox that made the Cannons or Liturgy, are we abſolved from obeying them. And what if any Subjects think that the King is not Orthodox? And Parliaments, who alſo make our Laws, contain men of many minds: And the Parliament of 1640. is ſaid by the Biſhops to have been far from Orthodox, even to have been Presbyterians, and Eraſtians, and even for Rebellion; and yet they

mad

made divers Laws which the King consented to and ratified: Were not men obliged by those Laws: And indeed if the Lawmakers being not Orthodox null his Laws about Religion, why not all his other Laws.

But it may be you will say, that it is not all the people that must judge whether the King and Parliament be Orthodox, but the Bishops for them. *Ans.* But who shall judge whether the Bishops be Orthodox? And if all be resolved into the implicite belief of the Bishops, why not of the civil Rulers as well? Or why not as the Papists on Pope and Councils?

I suppose to avoid all this you will not say, that he is a separatist that preacheth when forbidden by any Prince whatsoever, Turk, Heathen, Arrian, Eutychian, Idolater, Papist? Where then will you fix the ratifying Character? All men are heterodox in some degree? How shall we know the degree which absolveth us from our obedience,

And how cometh an Orthodox man to be authorized to do mischiefs and forbid the needful preaching of the Gospel any more than a heretick? or a Christian more than a heathen? I think he is bound to do more good then they, and not authorized to do more hurt? God never made him a judge whether the Gospel shall be preacht or not, nor whether the people shall be saved, or left to perish in their ignorance and sin.

Either then all are separatists that preach against the Laws of Heathens, Hereticks or Papists: And so the Orthodox Churches have in many or most Ages and places been separatists: or else we are cast upon confounding impossibilities to know who the separatist is.

Especially in *Aristocracies* and *Domocracies*, where the Rulers are of many minds, and the people can never know them all, nor when the Orthodox, have the Major *Vote*.

And I would know, whether it be only Rightful Princes or also Usurpers, whose Laws are the bond of the Churches Unity. If of Usurpers, then all the Prelates that conformed not in the times of the late Usurpation were Schismatical separatists by your definition: But to do them right, few of my acquaintance that could by conformity stay in, did then refuse conformity: I hear that you were then no separatist. But Bishop *Guning*, Dr. *Wild*, Dr. *Hide* and a great many more, took another course; and will not thank you if you stigmatize them with us. But if it be not the Laws of Usurpers in the Roman Empire by your measure? How few were the Emperours that came not in by meer conquest, or by killing, putting out the eyes, or ejecting

ing their predeceſſors, or without any juſtifiable right? And what a caſe *Rome*, *Italy*, *Spain* and *Africa* were in after the firſt conqueſts of the *Gothes* and *Vandals*, and all the Weſtern Empire in the days of the *Henries*, *Frederick* and many others, while men were fighting for the Empire, and Popes claimed the making and unmaking of them all; And even in *France* ever ſince the days of *Chilperic* for many Ages, eſpecially among the progeny of *Charles* the great, it is not to be hid: This way you deſtroy or confound the Churches.

I cannot imagine what you will reply to this? unleſs you ſay that, [*it is neither the Title, nor the Orthodoxneſs of Princes, which is neceſſary to make their Lawes the bond of Church unity: but it is the goodneſs of their Laws: at leaſt that they impoſe no ſin upon us*]. *Anſ.* 1. Then if the uſurpers impoſed no ſin, they were Schiſmaticks that obeyed them not. 2. Let that be the rule: who ſhall be judge whether it be ſin or not? If I be a diſcerner for my ſelf, I have told you how much and great ſin I fear, till you are diſpleaſed with the intimation: And when you have proved all thoſe particulars named, to be no ſins, you have done more than yet is done: And if you think you can or do prove it, muſt none have Chriſtian Communion who think your proof invalid, and that you do it worſe than Biſhop *Taylor* that maintained hurtleſs lying.

§ 56. But the other half of the definition of a ſeparatiſt is [*they adminiſter Sacraments by other Rules and after a different manner than what the Church requireth.*

Anſ. 1. Why will you ſo reproach your Church? we do it by no other rule by the *Scripture*; and doth not the Church require that the Scripture be a Rule? You know *Polydore Virgil* and other Papiſts, ordinarily make this ſignal difference of Proteſtants and Papiſts, that the Proteſtants make the Scripture the only Rule of their Religion: On which ſuppoſition *Francis Peron* formed his act of diſputing againſt them. And are not the Church of *England* Proteſtants? If you add another rule, it followeth not that we have another than you have, though you have another beſides what we have.

2. You ſay [*we deny the fact which is evident to all perſons*] and you ſpeak of me: Is this true? What Sacraments do you mean? I never ordained any: I never confirmed any: I have married very few, if thoſe be Sacraments: I have baptiſed no one theſe twenty years: I gave the Lords ſupper to none for about eighteen years, and rarely ſince as I told you. *But, others do?* *Anſ.* And if they have no better reaſon to juſtifie the forſaking of the Miniſtry than you give, well may they go on to do it.

3. Do you mean hereby [*Rulers*] the ſame as before by [*Laws*]

or

or what mean you? I suppose its the Canon and Liturgy that you mean. And if by the [*Church*] you mean any thing but the *King and Parliament* you are unintelligible: For the Church hath but two visible essential parts, the Regent and the *subject* parts. And of the Regent only the supreame is essential, the rest being also subjects, and but Integrals: And it is a [*Requiring* Church which you mention. And so it seemeth that it is but a *lay Church*: And nothing but a *Christian Kingdom*.

4. I have told you that the *French* and *Dutch* Churches here administer the Sacraments by another rule than your Liturgy, and yet are no Schismaticks.

5. And your rule hath many parts: It requireth Preaching, praying, reading the Psalmes and two Chapters, and delivering baptisme and the Lords Supper in Christs words, and repeating the Creed, the Lords Prayer and the Decalogue. And all that I do when I officiate for any man (for I have no Church), and others do it with whom I converse. But if it be omitting *any thing* else in your rule that maketh a separation, what is it? I oft hear Conformists omit divers Prayers. I have seen Dr. *Horton* give the Lords Supper, *I* think, to the greater part that sate. I doubt most Parishes separate if every omission make a separatist.

6. But thus far you satisfie me, that you judge all for separatists [that Preach without all your Assent, consent, subscriptions, that the Covenant bindeth no man living, no not the Parliament men that took it, to endeavour any alteration of Church Government, that it is not lawful to resist any Commissioned by the King (without exception) and much more such: That all are separatists that administer not Sacraments according to your rule, which pronounceth baptized Infants saved so dying, without excepting Atheists, *Infidels*, or any, and this as undoubted and certain by Gods word; which requireth the Minister to refuse Baptisme and Christendome, where the dedicating Image of the Cross is not submitted to, when the Parent or adult judge it an unlawfull Sacrament: And where baptisme must be denyed to all that will not make Godfathers and Godmothers the sole Covenanting undertakers for their Children, without speaking a Covenanting word themselves: And when your rule requireth all Ministers to deny Sacramental Communion to all that Scruple kneeling in the reception, and yet excommunicateth them and ruineth them for not Communicating when they are rejected: And also *ipso facto* Excommunicate: To omit much more such, this is your rule, which he that swerveth from is a Separatist.

7. But

7. But I had thought that we had not been like thoſe late cavilling Papiſts that will not diſtinguiſh *fundamentats* from any little points, leſt it loſe them a paultry advantage of abuſing men? doth not every good law and rule diſtinguiſh between *Eſſentials*, *Integrals*, *and accidents*, and make more Accidents than are *Integrals*, and *Integrals*, than are Eſſentials. And doth your rule do otherwiſe. If not, tell us what *parts* of your rule are neceſſary to one, and what to the other, or you ſay nothing to reſolve the caſe. *Is* every line and Ceremony Eſſential to the Church, and to each member. If not how cometh our omiting a form or Ceremony to cut us off as a ſeparated Church any more than every breach of Law cuts off a man from the Commonwealth.

Yea, if your Church be but a *Chriſtian Kingdome*, do not you cut off all from that Kingdome too, that refuſe your Forms or Ceremonies or Subſcriptions.

8. But Sir to be ſhort with you, I *will yet believe that Chriſt is the Inſtituter of the* Church; and that he hath himſelf made Laws which are ſufficient to be at leaſt the bond of their unity, yea for more than *Eſſentials*, even the *Integrals*, and many accidents; and hath given Laws to regulate all mens Laws that determine of needfull undetermined accidents: And that no man ſhould be cut off from the Church or taken as ſeparated that breaketh no Law of God, yea thoſe that are neceſſary to Church unity and Communion: And that the grand Schiſmaticks of the world, are the Engineers that fabircate needleſs, impoſſible dividing termes and conditions of unity and Communion.

§ 57. But you tell me that [*we do the ſame things in the ſame manner as the ſeparatiſts:* Ergo *we are diſingenious for denying* your accuſation].

Anſ. 1. Judge of the fact by what is ſaid.

2. We do not ſay. 1. That you are no true Miniſters or Churches. 2. Nor that it is unlawful to Communicate with you: *Ergo* it is not true that we do the ſame things.

3. But is the *External action* [the *whole ſame* that maketh a ſeparatiſt. A Parſon in the Ale-houſe loſt his Common prayer book: When he came to Church he told them his miſhap, and only read what was in the Bible, Query *whether* his flock and he were ſeparatiſts. An old Parſon that I was bred under could ſcarce ſee, but could ſay moſt of the Prayers without book: He ſaid what he could remember, and got a day labourer one year, and a Taylor another to read the Chapters; *Query.* Whether we were all ſeparatiſts.

§ 58. But

§. 58. But you undertake to tell the Reason why I *am unwilling to confess a separation, because we have formerly severely condemned it in others, and yet do the same things for which we charged others as guilty of a sinful separation.*

Ans. If this be not true, it is not well; shew me where, and prove, when I ever condemned any for the same *that I do*, or else take more heed what you write hereafter.

§. 59. *Serm.* p. 33. [For the *Assembly of Divines urged their dissenting Brethren to comply with the Rules of Government, and charged them with Schism, if they did not*, &c.

Ans. 1. It's a Foul mistake in matter of Fact, if you think that I *was that Assembly*, yea or *any one* of them; or that what they did, I did: or those of my acquaintance did it. And it is not much better to pretend that I or they were in all things of their mind: Doth the Assemblies judgment concern me any more than you? Did not you conform to them as much as I did?

2. But what mean you to wrong your Hearers by such gross confusion, to joyn in your Application Dr. *Owen*, and *me*, (and Mr. *Corbet* I think) with the Assembly, when it is publickly known that in those matters we were of three several opinions: (And who are they that differ not in as great matters?)

(1.) It's known that except seven or eight, the Assembly men were all *Conformists* when they came thither: And either they were *suddenly changed*, or not: if not, they were *Conformists* still, and then no wonder that they were of your mind.

And indeed I know that they were not all of one mind: Most of them were moderate *Conformists* that thought it lawful, but that it were much better be without it, than make it a snare to silence Ministers, and divide the Church, and therefore were glad that it was laid by: Such were Mr. *Vines*, Mr. *Burgess*, and, I think, most. Some were for Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s way, that no one form of Church Government was of Christs Command, but all left to prudence as civil Government is: Such was Dr. *Edward Reignolds* and some others; some were for the sole Government of the Magistracy, called *Erastians*: Such was Mr. *Thomas Coleman*, and how many more I know not: Many of the Parliament liked these Men best: And these were also for an indifferency of the Clergy form: And when Mr *Coleman* was chosen to give the Covenant to the house of Lords, they took it on his Exposition, that it meant not the Exclusion of the Primitive Episcopacy. some were more tenacious of the *Primitive Episcopacy*, and about

to enter a protestation for it; but that it was declared that *only the* English *form as described in the Concatenation was excluded:* These were Dr. *Cornel. Burges*, the excellent *Thom. Gataker*, and many more; And some few were for the *Divine right of Presbytery* (and after more:) And the five dissenters and Mr. *Philips* were Independents. But take them as *Conformists*, as *Erastians*, and as Indifferents, and judge whether they were not more of your judgment, then of Dr. *Owen's* or Mine, and it's no dishonour to you: for I think I have not read of many Assemblies of worthier men since the *Apostles* days. But they were but men.

But if indeed they *were all suddenly changed from Conformity to Presbytery*, when they came to *Westminster*; what a dishonour is such mutability to *Conformists*? And how little hold is there of them; if so many of the best of them will so easily change with the times? What wonder if you shall do so?

2. And as for Dr. *Owen*, he was known to joyn with the Independents: And sure you will not interess him in the Assemblies Judgment.

3. And Mr. *Corbet* and I are of one mind; And I thought that the truth was divided beween the three parties, and that all of them wanted necessary skill and diligence for the healing of those divisions and the concord of the faithful: And the event excused me in that censure. And now, is the *Synods* Judgment more ours or yours?

(2.) But either this *Synod* were in the right or not: If not, why then will you follow them, or plead their testimony? If yea, then they did well in being against the Liberty of the *Prelatists* also.

(3.) But is it possible that you can expect that men should believe, that *their Case* and *ours* are the same, or that either *All* must be tolerated or *none* that conform not; and that the bare talking for or against Toleration, without distinguishing the Tolerable from the Intolerable, doth tend to mens Edification. He that will tolerate all, is bad; and he that will tolerate none that differ, is mad. As it's an ill argument, *Vespæ habent favos, & apes habent favos*; *Ergo vespæ sunt apes*: So it is not a good one to say, *Wasps Nests should be destroyed: Ergo Bee-hives* should be destroyed.

§. 60 *But wherein lay the different Cases?*

Ans. In many things and great, however you untruly make them like.

First the Assembly never endeavoured to turn the Independents out of the Parish Churches, and benefices, nor to silence them, forbidding them

them publick preaching, as you do us; but only would hinder them from gathering Churches out of other mens Parishes.

2. The Assembly put on the Independants, no Oath, no Declaration, Profession, Subscription, or Covenant as necessary to their Ministry, which both sides confessed not to be lawful; and so would have imposed no positive bond which they scrupled, but only the said Omission of their promiscuous unlimited Church-gathering.

3. They imposed no Liturgy, no one Ceremony, no practice on them, contrary to their Consciences.

4. They urged them to declare but what Limits they would allow to their Church-gathering Liberty; that it might not extend to Hereticks and the intolerable, and could not prevail; Judge now whether these Cases are of any kin? Save in the *genus* of not allowing unlimited Toleration, which we hold to as well as they Grant us leave to Preach in the Publick Churches, and to be capable of guiding reformed Parish Churches, yea, or but to Preach or Officiate Publickly for nothing, though we live on Alms and beg our Bread, and we will thank you: Yea, though you hold us to all the terms and concessions in the Kings Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs: And is this like the Case of the Assembly, that never offered either to silence an Independent, or forbid him Parsonages, Lectures, Colledge preferments, or impose on him any one scrupled promise, profession or practice?

And yet *I* again say, both sides were faultily wanting in the knowledge and use of the terms of Peace.

§ 61. *Serm.* p. 35. [*So that whatever false colours and pretences some men make use of to justifie their present practices, if the judgment of their own Brethren may be taken, 'tis no better than plain and down-right separation.*]

Ans. 1. Were they not as much *your Brethren* as mine, and nearer to your Judgment?

2. Let the Reader judge, whether it be half so great separation or distance, as the *Conformists* have among themselves, while one part say that their Church is but Lay in the Essential Head, and the other half say, *It is Clergy*, and so are really of two Churches: And when one party saith, if the King and the Bishops Command contrary Translations, Versions, Times, Places, Liturgies, and modes of worship, the Bishops are to be obeyed before the King, and the other saith the King is to be obeyed before the Bishops. To omit abundance of greater differences than some would perswade men is between us and them.

§ 62. Serm. [*And I must needs say, I never saw any Cause more weakly defended, no not that of Polygamy and Anabaptisme, than that of those who allow it to be Lawful to joyn in Communion with us, and yet go about to vindicate the separate Meetings among us from the guilt of a sinful Separation.*]

Ans. 1. I have long observed, when some men pass a sentence on others, and call them by reproachful names, it ordinarily more truly sheweth what the *speaker is*, than what the Person or Cause is that he speaks of: For it is so natural for the streams to be like the Spring, and the fruit like the Tree, and the mouth to speak from the abundance of the heart, that one may much conjecture what the *Speaker is* by his words: But what the Cause and Man is that he speaketh of, you can little know, while the speaker oft little knoweth it himself or would not have another know it. Neither your confidence nor mine will determine a wise Reader.

§. 63. To *pag.* 36. I Answer, 1. Your Text is so clear and full a Confutation of your Sermon, that it's hard to know how a mind not strongly prejudiced could have preached such a Sermon, or pleaded for the silencing of so many such Ministers from such a text; Yea, or can need any more to confute you than to read your Text: 1. It is supposed that it was All that had attained to the truth of Christianity that must walk by the same rule. 2. It was a Divine Rule then known. 3. They were to bear with each other in loving Communion while they grew up to more. If this condemn not *making and imposing* new humane unnecessary Rules, containing that which multitudes of impartial Conscionable men as wise as their Reproachers cannot excuse from much heynous sin, and silencing and excommunicating all that obey them not, and when they forbid them Communion, call them Separatists; I do despair of understanding sence.

And to pag. 37. We come as near you as we can in Conscience; and we know our own Consciences better than you do. But whether you condemn not your selves as Separatists in denying communion where we preach as if you only were the Church, and any that want but your Liturgy were none, Yea when we had the License of the King; unbyassed men will be able to discern.

§. 64. Serm. pag. 37. [*But why then is this kept as such a mighty secret in the Breasts of their Teachers? Why do they not Preach it to them in their Congregations? Is it for fear they should have none left to Preach to? That is not to be imagined of Mortified and Conscientious men: Is it lest they should seem to condemn themselves while they Preach against Separation*

Separation in a Separate Congregation? This, I confess, looks odly; and the tenderness of a mans mind in such a Case, may out of meer shamefacedness keep him from declaring a truth which flies in his face while he speaks it.]

Ans. 1. Alas, you shew us, that some men perceive not when it flyeth in their faces. [Reader, hence take heed of Believing words of Reproach against Adversaries, when Interest and Sideing hath made men partial. Would you think that all this *intimated silence* were an untruth against *publick Testimony*?

1. I have many and many times declared in print what he intimateth that we dare not Preach. And is not *Printing* a far more Publick declaration, than speaking it in one Room?

2. When I began to Preach at St. *James*'s, I read a Profession to the Congregation openly, that I preacht not there as to a separate Church, but as in concord with all Christs Church on Earth, for the necessity of the People that had not many of them heard a Sermon many a year, the Parish having 40000 if not 60000 Souls more than could hear in the Parish Church.

3. I built a Chapel by money partly begg'd, and partly to my greater loss than I will mention, that I might but have helpt those needy Souls for nothing: For the second Sermon, one that Preacht for me (that had suffered imprisonment for the Kings Cause) was sent to Gaol, to my great Trouble and Charge. And when I might not use it (said One in Power, *Though you would use the Common-Prayer there*) *I* gave it up to the use of the Parish, and take it thankfully of Dr. *Lloyd* that he will there teach his People.

4. I have many and many a time in the Pulpit openly Preacht against Separation, even what he now desireth.

5. Not past a Fortnight before his Sermon, I Preacht near him (at the Verge of his Parish in my Lecture) two whole Sermons of it, on *Luk.* 15. the Case of the two Sons; shewing that there are three notable sorts of Separation. 1. The *Persecutors* that forcibly scatter the Flock, as the Papists by dividing, sinful impositions. 2. The *Prophane Separatist* like the Prodigal, who had rather be at the Tavern, the Play-house, the Whore-house, *&c.* than at Church. 3. The *passionate peevish honest Christian*, as in the Text, [*He was angry and would not come in.*] Here I shewed by many reasons, how faulty and hurtful this mistaking passionate Separation is: And I took that occasion to give them many *Reasons why I communicate with the Parish Church my self, and Separate not from them*; and I told them my judg-

ment,

ment, that they that *suffer meerly for not-hearing, or not-communicating thrice a year* as the Law requireth, cannot justifie their Cause without some extraordinary reason, if they live in a Parish that hath a Minister capable of that Office. But I did not malignantly equal the Son that had long *served his Father, and not transgressed his Commandment*, with his Brother in his Prodigal desertion of his Father: But on the next words [*His Father went out to him and intreated him to come in;*] I shewed that Gods Condescention, and Method in satisfying his mistaken passionate Children, should direct Ministers and others how they also should deal with such. And that violence instead of loving Condescension, reasoning and necessary forbearance of such Infirmities, sheweth, 1. That such consider not the corruption of Humane Nature, and how bad all men are. 2. They know not what need of Forbearance they have themselves; nor how liable they are to *Error* and to Sin. 3. They imitate not God our Father and Saviour, and know not what manner of Spirit they are of. 4. They have not due acquaintance with the preciousness of Gods Graee and Image, that cannot perceive it, if there be but such an Errour or Passion to obscure it. 5. They consider not that they also may be Tempted, and what Temptation may do even with upright Souls. 6. They are strangers to the Pastoral office; They should excel in Love and Tenderness as much as in Knowledge, and as mothers quiet crying Children, and not therefore cast them out of doors. 7. They Cross the ends of the Ministry, if they take the Converting of Souls to be any of its end: For as Generation so Regeneration maketh *Infants* and *Children* before they are grown Men; and Children will be weak and troublesome: And he that would have no such Children, must not endeavour mens Conversion. 8. Yea, they greatly increase the Disease which they would Cure: Men will not love those that hurt them so easily as others: And when they are displeased with you, they are the hardlier pleased with your Doctrine. 9. Driving men into the Church, maketh it like a Prison and corrupteth it as composed of involuntary Members. 10. Yea, they must destroy the Church, if they will suffer none in it that have as great weaknesses as these. Thus I declared both the evil of passionate Separation, and of mistaking the way of Cure. I would repeat the Sermons, were it not for fear of being tedious.

6. I have Printed in my second *Plea for Peace*, what our *Non-conformity is not*, containing as much in this point as he can reasonably desire, as it was approved by many others (named in our Judgment about

about the Interest of Reason in Religion) so that he cannot say that I speak but of my self.

7. I suppose he believeth that I am acquainted with more Non-conformable Ministers than he is (or else he will not think that I am any such *Antesignanus* as Bishop *Morley* calleth me:) And I meet with few or none that contradict what in this case of Separation I have Published; They are commonly for Reformed Parish Churches (not taking all in the Parish for the Church, but bounding Churches in Parishes for Order;) and Preach elsewhere but on necessity and as Assistants and not as Adversaries.

8. Doth not our Practice (who go to the Parish Churches) shew our Judgments to the People if we said nothing?

9. I could not have drawn the People so much from too great distance if I had not preached to them. At *Acton* I constantly heard Dr. *Rieves*, and his Curate, and I preached only in my house between his Sermons, and then led the People to the Church, which Judge *Hales* my neighbour thought was good service to the Church. And the very Sermon that I was sent to the Common Gaol for, was on *Matth.* 5. *Blessed are the meek*, perswading to submissive peace and patience.

10. When Bishop *Morley* forbad me to preach in his Dioceſs, and I could not get leave at my departure to Preach to my hearers one farewel Sermon in publick; I Preacht in a private house to them on *David*'s words [*Bring back the Ark of God into the City, if I have found favour*, &c.] purposely to perswade them as my last advice, not to depart from the publick Parish Assembly, though the Liturgy be there the publick worship. But if the Minister that is there shall be intolerable. 1. As utterly unable. 2. Or a Heretick. 3. Or so malignant an Enemy of Godliness as to do more hurt than good; I advised them not to own any such Minister, nor encourage him in his Usurpation. And it was on that account that they long forbore, till the *Vicar* was dead and a better succeeded him.

11. Since then I have written to my old Flock to perswade them to joyn in the Parish Assembly, and *I* hear not of three that do refuse it.

And all this I have said as to that matter of fact, to shew you how farr to believe this Reverend Doctor's intimated ironical accusation.

If he say, that *Other Preachers do not so.*

I Answer First, How knoweth he the Negative that never heareth them, but like a separatist avoideth it as unlawful?

2. Is it not likely that in season they preach *their judgment*?

3. But I confess they may find more profitable work than to preach over

over all the suspected passages in the *Liturgy*, and other parts of Conformity, and answer all the Peoples objections against them. The Builders and Owners of the houses are the fittest to do such offices to maintain it.

§. 65. *Is it that they fear the reproaches of the People; which some few of the most Eminent persons among them, have found they must undergo if they touch upon this subject?*

Ans. 1. So farr as your accusation is untrue as to the fact, it's but a further ill intimation to ask, why they *do not* that which *they do?*

2. If they that should better know what their auditors most need, must preach what you appoint that know them less, you may make their Sermons for them as well as their prayers.

3. Those few Persons it seems at least *toucht* on what you say they preacht not: And for my part, whom I know you mean for one, I never felt my self much tempted to grudge at the Dissenters that therefore will not hear me: If they hear others more suitable to them by whom they can more profit, as more esteeming them, what hurt is that to me? Would I have none taught the knowledge of Christ, but by my self? While we have all one Faith, it's some convenience for men to assemble and hear, where they do it with unprejudiced, undisturbed minds.

4. If those persons you mention have before and since such censures as you intimate, done what you would perswade men that they do not, your self-contradiction is most palpable.

§. 66. *Serm.* [*For I know not how it cometh to pass that the most Godly people among them, can least endure to be told of their faults.*]

Ans. 1. Did you not intend [*the Most Godly*] for a scorn, you would confess it false.

2. If you mean those that we *esteem most Godly*, it is not true neither.

3. If you mean those that think themselves so, it's no wonder if they mistake; if not, it's not true.

2. I pray you take warning by them, or by your own reproof, and do not now shew that you are one of the *most Godly* by *less enduring* to be told of your faults. If otherwise, you have forecondemned your own impatience.

3. Verily they have dealt much more patiently with me than the Bishops and Canoneers have done: Though some have spoken their dislike of me, none of them (even when they were in power) did ever silence or imprison me nor ever forbid me to Preach (save once at an Assizes.)

Assizes.) How can you think that we can feel their censures, when we have so much worse to feel from the Canoneers? And when you ask, [*Is it for fear they should have none left to preach to?*] If you separated not from us, you would see that such have some left still.

§. 67. Serm. p. 42. [*Whence we see the Church of* Englands *endeavour after uniformity, is acquitted from Tyranny over the Consciences of men, by the Judgment of the most Learned of the Assembly*, &c.]

Ans. 1. Of the Assembly I have said enough.

2. If you think the Assemblies *Uniformity*, or their endeavours for it, were the same with the Church of *Englands*, none that know the case will be of your mind.

3. If you are intelligible we must suppose that you cite them to defend this as the conclusion which you own. The word [Tyranny] is too harsh to be used without need: But I suppose you include that the said *Endeavours* for *Uniformity* have no culpable severity in them. That is, that the Acts for *Uniformity*, the Canons, the Executing of them in Declarations, Subscriptions, Oaths, Practices, Punishments Corporal and Spiritual; are no Sin, but Lawful. In your Epistle you say *They* are ill men that say This is *stirring* up to persecution: All that *I* will say is, that if you own these *Endeavours* for *Uniformity*, *I* do not: and the judge is at the door.

§. 68. Serm. p. 44. [*If they form their judgments rather* by *prejudice and passion* and *interest*, *than from the Laws of God, or just Rules of Conscience*, &c.

Ans. 1. This is true and good: *If* we make not Gods Laws the Rule of Conscience, no wonder if we err: God preserve us from all corrupting prejudice, passion, interest and Canons.

2. But when you compare our temptation from *interest* with yours, *I* hope you will not say as Dr. *Asheton*, that *as going to the Bar of God he undertakes to make good, that it's through Pride* and *Covetousness that we conform not*; that is, that we choose the contempt of high and low, and to live on Alms, and multitudes in pinching poverty.

§. 69. Serm. p. 46. [*We find Uniformity and Order condemned as Tyrannical, till men come into power themselves; and then the very same things and arguments are used and thought very good and substantial, which before were weak and sophistical.*]

Ans. A true and sad confession; when *I* read your *I*renicon and this Sermon, I the more believe you: Therefore it hath been my happiness that I was never in Power, no nor ever on the uppermost side, unless as I am for the King. I remember Dr. *Rieves* told us in

the Pulpit that the reason why we were against Diocesan Bishops, was because we could not be Bishops our selves: And many others have said the like.

§. 70. Serm. [*Those that now plead for Toleration, did once think it the Mother of Confusion, the nurse of Atheism*, &c.]

Ans. 1. Sure though you often cite Dr. *Owen*, you mean not the Independents.

2. *If* they spake either for or against Toleration as you do without distinction, and were *for all* or *against all*, and distinguished not the *tolerable* from the *intolerable*, it's no great heed to be taken what they say. *If* there were but one false word imposed on you, which you could not assent to, and on 2000 such as you, should *you* be no more tolerated than a *Mahometan*?

§. 71. As to your advice to us p. 47. 48. 1. Did you think that because we must *bear with much that is amiss* in the Church, that therefore we must either *consent* to it, or practise it, and Covenant against all endeavours of amending it, or prefer it before better. The man you talk of out of Mr. *Ball* was near *Bremicham*, and was Melancholy to a kind of madness.

To your second *I* answer, *It* followeth not, that because we must not judge too hardly of *Impositions*, therefore we must *say, swear and do* all that is now imposed on us. Or that he that dares not do it, is unpeaceable. *I* would we knew in what cases only you would deny Obedience and Conformity your self. Doubtful passages and undoubted evils somewhat differ. A *fault-finding disposition*, and the *Roman* art that *Boccaline* mentions to swallow a Pumpion, have a mean between them. *Papists, Socinians*, or any that are uppermost, may call for Conformity under the names of Unity and Peace.

To the Third, *separation* was not the same thing in the mouth of the old *Non-conformists* as in yours: They took it first for unchurching the Parish Churches. 2. Or holding it a sin to communicate with them, if they might be excused as to kneeling, Crossing, *&c.* You take it for [*preaching when forbidden.*] I have named to you the old *Non-conformists* that preached when they could. And half of them *I* think got into small priviledged places, exempt from the Bishops power, and there preached most of them without the Liturgy, and all without the Ceremonies: And was not this against Law. Sure Bishop *Bancroft* that describeth their attempts to set up new Churches and Discipline was not of your mind concerning the *Non-conformists* judgment. We had but two in all *Shropshire*, and Dr. *Alleſtree* when a boy was

the

the Catechiz'd Auditor of one of them, being his next Neighbour (in a peculiar Chapel, without the Liturgy, &c.) And yet I think not that his Father and all that Assembly were separatists for hearing him. *Bradshaw* thought we should submit to a silencing Law, where our Ministry was unnecessary, and so do I. Dr. *Gouge* was a *Conformist* when he wrote the Book which you cite.

To your Fourth; Woe to them that believe our divisions indanger the Land and let in Popery, and yet will cause them, and no intreaty can procure them to forbear dividing us, when they may; and then revile them that have no way to remedy it, unless wilful heinous sinning be the way.

§ 72. That it is diseases (that love not their own names) in mens hearts, that make the trouble more than our different judgments and Assemblings, experience telleth us: I was never a settled Teacher, but in two places (saving a Lecture at *Coventry* in the War,) *viz.* An Assistant at *Budgnorth*, and a Pastor at *Kidder minster*: And in both places there is an honest Conformable and a Non-Conformable Minister: And the People go to the publick Assembly, and many hear the Non-conformist privately between the publick meetings: And both parties (as I hear) live in very much love and peace, and why might it not be so in other places, if there were the like Ministers and People, without all this envyous clamour and bugbear words of [*Antichristian*] on our side, or (*Separatists* and *Schismaticks on the other.*

§. 73. As to your next advices p. 53. 54. First, *Qui monet ut facias, &c.* We speak so much against rash ignorant Zeal, that you commend us against your purpose.

2. We thank you for the admonition [*not to be always complaining of hardships and persecutions.*] Doubtless our mercies are so great as forbid us to be over querulous; nay leave us unexcusable, if we are not very thankful. For my own part my sufferings have been very small from man, in comparison of what I endure in Soul and Body from my self. They are few days in which I am a not heavier burden to my self, than all my Enemies are. But First, I may not be senceless of the case of many better men, who have great families and no bread but what they have by Alms in poor Countreys where the people are fitter to receive than to give. And if they remove to bigger Towns, the Clergy tell them it is for gain, and they that have one, two, three or more perferments, reproach them as covetous that will rather beg than sin or famish, yet your Brother *Hickeringil* on the contrary pro-

claimeth *how little they get*: Were it my case as it is very many *Non-conformists*, to be in other mens debts, and have nothing to pay house rent, for cloaths, for bread, *&c.* and to have Wife and many Children to pacifie, and to live on bread and water, or little more, and be offered plenty if I would but do that which I take to be the hazard of my Soul, I should be sensible of the temptation.

2. And alas all this is nothing to the suffering of thousands of Souls! to perish for lack of knowledge, whose case it is lawful to compassion and lament.

3. And nature maketh it lawful to feel when one is hurt, and to confess that feeling.

4. And methinks if *Julian* that abuseth the Christians should say, your *Master bid you turn the other Cheek*, his scorn would but aggravate his Sin: Patience is our duty; But if they call us to it who Preach and Print, and call out for the Execution of the Laws against us (as many of the most eminent of the Clergy have long done) as you said in another case, *It will look but odly*: To preach to the Parliament, to put Fire to the Faggot, to accuse the King for his Licences and Clemency, to tell the Magistrates and the World, that our Schisms are because they execute not the Lawes, even the Laws that fine us forty pound a Sermon, and lay us in the Common Gaol with Malefactors, and banish us from Cities and Corporations, I say for these men to say [*complain not*,] is a smart accusation of themselves. For from good men good is to be expected; but if I meet with Gentlemen on the road that take away my Mony, clothes and horse, and wound me, and tell me how much I am beholden to them, because they did not cut my throat, it's lawful to know what they are, though I must be patient. And *I* told you before, when you talk of *being made a Sacrifice*, if a few despised men censure you, while you have all your Honour, Reputation, Riches and many preferments to arm you against their thoughts and breath, methinks sheweth that this Counsel is as seasonable to your self as to the suffering *Non-conformists*.

§. 74. Serm. 54. [*Where are the Priscillians that have been put to death by their instigation? What do such insinuations mean, but that our Bishops are the followers of* Ithacius *and* Idacius *in their cruelty; and they of the good and meek Bishop St.* Martin, *who refused communion with them on that account? If men entertain such kind thoughts of themselves, and such hard thoughts of their Superiours, whatever they plead for, they have no inclination to Peace.*]

Answ. 1. That is, to your Terms of Peace, and you being judge.

2. Know-

2. Knowledg is oft constrained: It is no sin to know History, much less Publick matter of present fact, and least of all, that which we see and feel. Is it a sin to know when a man is in prison, or when his goods or books are distrained, *&c?* I the rather speak to this, because a Reverend Reformed Bishop tells me also of this wrong, as if those Bishops case were unlike to his; and citeth the words of the Historian that mentioneth the suffering of the Churches in *Spain* on that account, as if *Maximus* had but taken advantage of the Bishops spleen to Tyrannize, and prey upon the Churches. I desire not to make any men seem worse then they are, nor causelessly to open the faults of any. I profess to the world that it is not in an impatient aggravating of any sufferings of my own (which are small,) that I write this, but as the true stating of the case between us. If the matter of fact be not truly stated, the matter of *right* cannot be well determined. I hate false History.

1. It is agreed on by many of the best Historians of that Age, beside *Beda*, that *Maximus* wanted nothing but a good Title to make him one of the best of *Emperours*: That he was said to be made Emperour by the *Brittish* Souldiers, against his will, and being once in, could not go back. His usurpation was wicked, but a way too common in the Empire. He was of a pious life, and great zeal for the Bishops and the Orthodox Religion; what he did was to please the Bishops and to suppress Herresie and Schisme: And it's like enough he thought by their friendship to strengthen himself. He rescued *Ambrose* at *Milan* from the *Arrians*, and by his threats deterred *Valentinian* (provoked by his Wife) from persecuting him, and so preserved the Church of *Milan* and many others.

2 I read not of any of the Bishops in all his Countreys that complyed not with this Usurper, save *Martin*, *Theognostus*, and *Ambrose*, (that was preserved by him.)

3. It was not *Ithacius* and *Idacius* only, but all the Synod of the Bishops, that were guilty, and that *Martin* separated from.

4. The *Priscillians* were down-right *Gnosticks*, and so are not the Nonconformists, who you say agree with you in Doctrine, *&c.*

5. It is but the death of *Priscillian* and a very few more that the Bishops were said to have procured; and they were ashamed of it when they had done, and denyed that it was their doing. You force me for Historical Verity to tell you, that they did not silence about 2000 Ministers, which is worse than many bodily afflictions; nor did they desire *Maximus* to make a Law that all that did not such things *as* should be ruined by Fines, Imprisoned, *&c.* Make them not worse *ours* than they were. Our Quakers are much like the *Priscillianists*: are

Had

Had it been but twice as *many of them* that had dyed in prison, as were put to death of the *Priscillianists*, the cases had not been much unlike. But Mr. *Thompson* that dyed in Prison at *Bristol*, Mr. *Field* that dyed in Prison here; Mr. *Hughes* that in Prison catcht his mortal sickness; Mr. *Joseph Allen* that had the same Lot, and many more such, were none of them like the *Priscillianists*; but men of whom I and such as I come far short.

6. The great mischief that those Bishops did was by suspecting men that *Fasted* and *Prayed* much, to be *Priscillians*; they brought reproach by unjust suspicions in all Countreys on the most strict Religious men; and *Martin* was called by them a *Priscillianist* for being against the Bishops Persecution of them. Let not me, but publick knowledge here make the comparison: How small was this reproach, for extent and continuance, in comparison of that which by occasion of Non-conformity hath been cast on men in *England?* My memory serveth me from 1623 or 24; Commonly in the Countreys, if a man did but pray in his family, and spend the Lords day in Religious Exercises, reading the Scripture, or repeating a Sermon, or reading a good book, or singing a Psalm, and was against swearing and drunkenness, he was made the common scorne, as a *Puritane*, and the Bishops Articles, and their reproach of Non-conformists, occasioned all this in the Rabble against those that were no Non-conformists. If you believe not me, believe a Conformist *Robert Bolton*, that saith more of the horrid abuse of Piety by the name of *Puritane*. And since then the same spirit hath used the *Name* of *Presbyterian*, *Schismatick*, *Separatist*, *Fanatick*, to the like reproach of seriousness and diligence in Religion, though not so universally as the name *Puritane* was; Yea if a man had but been for Lectures, and such like helps as Arch-Bishop *Grindall* was for (to his cost) or for afternoon Sermons, or would not read the book for Sunday dancing, *&c.* he was worse than suspected and reproached. My neighbours that I once was a Teacher to, did never presume to preach nor invade the ministerial Office, nor do any thing but the work of private Christians, that is, to pray and repeat the Sermon, and sing a Psalm, but because many ignorant Families that could not read, could not do any of this in their houses, they joyned with the Neighbours that performed it, and this not at time of Publick worship: yet because that more than four such met, they were distrained on and laid in Gaoles. Compare all this (and the removal of many hundred families out of the Land heretofore) with the consequents of the Bishops zeal against the *Priscillians*.

But

But remember that it is not in my thoughts to lay any of this upon the Bishops that came in since the Impositions and actions aforesaid, and had no hand in them, and cry not to Magistrates to execute the Laws, much less on men of such known moderation as divers of them are, nor on the Peaceable Conformists that own none of this.

7. And it must be remembred that *Martin* was but an odd man, and seemed singular against the Synods of all the Bishops, and a man of little Learning, like one of our Trades-men that is Religious. And therefore I have wondred that *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and our *Rich. Hooker*, did so openly decry the faults of the Bishops here, and take part with *Martin*, and not rather turn the reproach on him, as an unlearned Separatist, and Fanatick: But his Miracles silenced all reproaches; with the rooted esteem which serious Christians will still have for serious Piety, when the Reproachers have said and done their worst. Else one unlearned *Man* that went in sordid attire, and lived in a small thacht Cottage, and lay on the ground, and eat worse than our beggars do, and pleaded for the Gnosticks persons, was liker to have been born down as a mad Fanatick, than such men as Dr. *Twisse*, *Thomas Gataker*, *Richard Vines*, *Anthony Burges*, Mr. *Hughes*, *Joseph Allen*, and about 2000 more.

8. Lastly, Let it be noted that the Cause of St. *Martin* was, his *judgement that Heresie and Schisme*, even as bad as the *Gnosticks*, was not to be *punished by the sword*, but only by Church censures; and therefore that the Bishops did wickedly, in calling for the Magistrates sword against them; for then if the Heretick can get the Magistrate to be for him, the same sword may be drawn against the Orthodox: And so the *Priscillianists* once got a great Courtier to be for them, and a while turned the sword against their adversaries, which occasioned sufferings in *Spain* and other parts. And I wonder how *Baronius*, *Binnius*, or you that plead for the silencing and other afflicting of Non-conformists, under the name of [*Non-toleration*] and the *Churches endeavours* for *Uniformity*, can possibly keep out the light which would tell you that we may give you twenty to one in weighing your case and ours with *Ithacius* and *Martins*, if any impartial hand do hold the ballance. Is not your whole *cause*, who cry out for the execution of the Laws, and against our Toleration, (that is, that we are not to be endured) clean contrary to *Martins* cause?

§. As to your 3d. Advice, *pag.* 55. [*Not to Condemn others for that which themselves have practised.*]

I *Answer*, 1. Prove that I or any of my Acquaintance ever practised

ctised Ejecting, Silencing, Ruining men for things unnecessary, yea or for greater things. Whom did we ever forbid to Preach the truth? Whom did we cast out of all Church Maintenance? Whom did we imprison?

2. If any in *New-England* had done it, is that our doing? They that are against Christs Righteousness imputed, I hope will not joyn with you in imputing to us the sins of those that were no Kin to us, and we never saw.

3. What a pitiful Case is Mankind in, if such an Harangue of confounding words can make them believe, that Tolerating or not-Tolerating in Causes vastly different, are the same? Is it all one to deny men Liberty to seduce men from the essentials of the Faith, and to forbid many hundreds to preach Christs Gospel, unless they will openly profess that they Assent and Consent to three Books, and Covenant never to endeavour the Reforming of the Government of the Church, *&c?* Might not the Papists have said to us just as you do [*it is the same thing* for us to burn Protestants as Hereticks, as for you to expel the Subverters of the Faith.] But you that are for silencing us all, for not consenting to, *You know what*, have less excuse for calling it [*the same thing*] *unless you think Christ and a Liturgy to be same.*

It is therefore fitter to be answered with Compassionate Tears than Words, when you say *pag.* 56. that [*every one of them would practise the same were it in their Power, and think it very justifiable so to do*] *Answ.* O whither may he rowl that is tumbling down the Hill! I was never in Power: The *Independents* once were: They used it not as I would have had them: But did they or the Presbyterians Eject or Silence one another? Is it a good Consequence [you would silence a Quaker that denieth the Essentials of Christianity: Ergo, *every one of you, were it in your power, would Silence, Imprison, and Ruine them,* that differ from you in Ceremony, Form, or Subscription like ours?] O how incredible are the words of some applauded men!

I remember that at the *Savoy* when it was said how some had used the Episcopal, Bishop *Walton* excused and reproved me, and said, that [*indeed I had then written against Ejecting or Troubling any honest worthy man for being Episcopal or against the Parliament, but that the incompetent and vicious of all sorts equally should be Ejected But* (saith he) *did not you write that if the Sword interposed not, but meer liberty to Volunteers were granted to all parties, the Prelatical Liturgick Church would be like a Tavern or Inne where many sober Persons come, but so many others also, as would make it a place of no very great inviting Fame?*] I confessed the truth, and still confess it.

§. 76. To

§. 76. To your 4th. Advice, [*not to make our differences seem greater than they are.*

I do consent. But 1. Did our 18 or 19 years Silencing them, do that? 2. Do not you do it, that make men believe that we are *Intolerable* and to be Silenced, and that Separate from our Congregations as if it were a sin to join with us? 3. We desire only a true stating of the Case.

The *honest dealing* which you demand, I and many others constantly perform; and it's ill to intimate that we do not. But you add,

§. 77. [*It's hard to understand if occasional Communion be lawful, that constant Communion should not be a Duty.*]

Anſ. Some Truths are hard to men of great Wit. It's lawful to have communion in our Aſſemblies (as I am ready to prove) and yet you think not *any*, much leſs *conſtant*, Communion to be a Duty. It's lawful to have Communion with the *French*, *Dutch*, or *Greek* Church; muſt conſtant Communion be therefore a Duty? It's lawful to have Communion with an ignorant Reader, or a drunken Prieſt (at leaſt in your Judgment;) Is it therefore a duty to ſeek no better?

§. 78. Serm. [*All underſtanding men will conclude that they prefer ſome little intereſts of their own, before the Honour of Chriſt and the Peace of the Church.*]

Anſ. 1. The word [*Little*] came well in as to your ſenſe: Truly *Poverty and Ruin* are little intereſts: I cannot imagine what you mean, unleſs it be *Reputation*. But is not your Reputation with the *Higheſt Perſons*, and the multitude, a more tempting Intereſt than our Reputation with ſuch as you much Contemn. 2. But do you underſtanding men know our hearts better than we? And are you ſure that none are *underſtanding* that be not as partially Cenſorious as you? If we prefer our Little intereſt, why do we not Conform? If you take us all for Mad men, diſpute not with us: if not, can we be ignorant that *Carnal Intereſt* is on your ſide, and are none of us Capable of it? 3. I ſhould have taken it as too ſharp an intimation to ſay that *Your Greater Intereſt ſwayeth you*: No man that is a Chriſtian taketh this vain vexatious World for his great Intereſt. And to make the *Little Intereſt* of Proſecuted, Beggared, Ruined Non-conformiſts to be that which beareth down, both all the intereſt of Wealth, Eaſe and Worldly honours and the intereſt of the Churches Peace and the intereſt of their own Salvation, and all this by no other proof than a Suppoſition that your Sagacity knoweth their hearts, and that all underſtanding men are of your mind] the naughtineſs of this is ſo great that it will not ſuffer you to ſee it. Sir, as wiſe as you are, I know my own

heart better than you do (and ſo do my Brethren know theirs.) If you would ſwear the contrary I will not believe you. And I tell you, it is *no Little Intereſt* that moveth me; it is greater than a Deanery or a Biſhoprick. I were worſe than mad, if 1. I conſumed my ſmall eſtate, 2. And my Health. 3. And denied my Eaſe. 4. And all worldly Wealth and Pleaſure. 5. And expoſed my ſelf to be called a Schiſmatick and a Rogue, by the Conformiſts. 6. And lay my ſelf under the ruining dangers of the Law. And 7. to be written againſt as doing all this by ſin 8. And all this under the languiſhings and pains of ſickneſs, expecting when I am called to my account; I ſay I were worſe than mad, if I choſe all this for that which you call [*Little intereſt.*] 9. And if *Reputation* with my poor deſpiſed party be that *Little intereſt*, you confute your ſelf before, where you ſay how much I have undergone of their impatient Cenſures. Have I flattered them? Have I not ſaid more againſt their faults than you have done, though not againſt their Duty? 10. Some of my heart-judges ſay, it is a *ſemel dixiſſe*, to avoid the imputation of mutability. But their Companions confute them who charge me with my retractations; and who ſee by my writings that I left room for ſecond thoughts, and have not ſilenced them to eſcape the Cenſure of any whomſoever. I have left my Reputation to God, and never was ſo thin Skin'd as to be unable to bear a Cholerick breath: I live not upon Air, or the thoughts of men, who will ſhortly with me be ſilent in the duſt. They that know how many Books, perhaps ſcores, have been written againſt me, by Sectaries of many ſorts, and ſome by good and ſober men, Presbyterians, Independents and Prelatical, and how little they have broke my peace, will not think *applauſe* is my *Little intereſt*. Had *I* been as you *I* would have left out this Charge of *Little intereſt*, leſt it ſhould tempt men to compare your Caſe and ours.

§. 79. Your 5th. Advice is juſt: *I* hate Charging you or any with unjuſt ſuſpicions of inclinations to Popery. *I* know ſome few men whom *I* have reaſon to ſay, Defend *Grotius* as one of their Religion; who thought that the Proteſtants can never unite among themſelves till they unite with *Rome* as the Miſtreſs Church; and that the Councils even that of *Trent* are ſound in the Faith, and that ſecuring the rights of Kings and Biſhops, and diſowning the Schoolmens abuſes, and the Clergies evil lives, and reducing the Pope to rule us, not Arbitrarily but by the Canons, are enough to ſatisfie and reconcile us. But to charge this on all, or moſt, is unjuſt: We know what Biſhop *Barlow*, Biſhop *Croft* and divers others have done to ſignifie their Faithfulneſs

fulneſs to the Proteſtant Cauſe. And if *Contzen's* way prevail not, to drill men they know not whither by degrees, *I* hope of the 9000 or 10000 Clergie men in *England*, one thouſand will not turn to Popery. But *I* muſt ſay, that when ſome Prelates made it their great buſineſs to Silence, Shame and Ruin us, and drive us far enough from Perſons of Power, undertaking to preſerve the Proteſtant Religion better without us than with us, and after all, cry out themſelves that we are in danger of Popery by their own Pupils and Diſciples, whoſe inſtruction they undertook; men will have leave to think of this awake, and to judge of Cauſes by Effects.

§. 80. Your Counſel is good, [*Not to run the hazard of all for a ſhow of greater Liberty to our ſelves.*] Should *I* tell you three ſtories of our hazarding our own Liberties becauſe we would not do what you diſſwade us from, one in 1660, and another 1662, and another about 1667, it would be a pair of Spectacles to ſome. 2. But will not all that have eyes ſee, who doth more for Toleration of *Popery*, they that ſay [*Popery and you ſhall ſtand and fall together, except you will ſay, ſubſcribe and do all that is preſcribed you*;] or they that ſay [*We cannot do that which we take to be hainous ſin?*] Do you think the Papiſts had not rather (with you) that we were Silenced, than that we Preach, who have been their greateſt Adverſaries? If you will rather let in Toleration of Popery, than you will Tolerate Proteſtants that fear the guilt of Lying, Perjury, and many other Evils, ſhould they do that which you Confeſs *indifferent*, let God be judge between you and us.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 27. l. 19. blot out *not*. p. 30. l 3. r. *potu*. p. 35. l. 6. r. *Lucian*. p. 40. l. 30. r. *will not read*. p. 75. l. 25. r. *plebs*. p. 76. l. 21. r. *hearers*. p. 80. l. 27. for *ſubmiſſion*, r. *ſubſcription*. p. 83. l. 8. r. *accuſers*. p. 85. l. 14. for *ratifying*, r. *notifying*. p. 86. l. laſt. r. *here by Rules*. p. 88. l. 2. r. *fundamentals*. p. 99 l. laſt, for *Brother*, r. *Maſter*. p. 101. l. 5. blot out *Reformed*. p. 101. l anti-pen. r *as ours*. l. ult. dele *ours* and *are*.